

JAN 31 1917  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

Volume XXXII

FEBRUARY, 1917

Number 2

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

JAMES EUSTACE SHAW

## CONTENTS

LOVEJOY, A. O.—On the Meaning of 'Romantic' in Early German Romanticism, Part II, . . . . .	65
GEROULD, GORDON HALL.—The Old English Poems on St. Guthlac and their Latin Source, . . . . .	77
THOMPSON, ELBERT N. S.—Tom Brown and Eighteenth-Century Satirists, . . . . .	90
RYPINS, STANLEY I.—Notes on 'Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem,' . . . . .	94

### Reviews:—

HENRY C. SHELLEY, The Life and Letters of Edward Young. [Wm. H. Hulme.], . . . . .	96
EDWARD FRANKLIN HAUCH, Gottfried Keller as a Democratic Idealist. [Henry Wood.] . . . .	109
HARRY KURZ, European Characters in French Drama of the Eighteenth Century. [C. F. Zeek, Jr.] . . . . .	113
MAX HERERMANN, Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance. [Neil C. Brooks.] . . . .	116

### Correspondence:—

BALDWIN, EDWARD CHAUNCEY.—A Note on <i>Paradise Lost</i> IX, . . . .	119
ROLLINS, HYDER E.—Notes on Thomas Deloney, . . . . .	121
COOK, ALBERT S.—Matthew Arnold's <i>The Church of Brou</i> , . . . .	124

### Brief Mention:—

WILLIAM ODLING, The Technic of Versification: Notes and Illustrations;—NARCISO ALONSO CORTÉS, Casos Cervantinos que tocan a Val-ladolid;—ERIK BJÖRKMAN, <i>Morte Arthure</i> ;—A. G. BRODEUR, <i>Prose Edda</i> ;—WALTER C. BRONSON, American Prose, . . . . .	124
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Thirty-Five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-  
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume  
is \$2.00 for the United States and Mexico; \$2.25  
for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to Murray P. Brush; and for the Italian and Spanish Departments to J. E. Shaw. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays, and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.



## OXFORD GERMAN SERIES

BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS

General Editor: Julius Goebel, Ph. D.



*Just Issued*

# Sappho

Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen von

FRANZ GRILLPARZER

Edited, with introduction and notes, Inhaltsangaben, Inhalts- und Erläuterungs-  
fragen, Rückblicke und Themen by JOHN L. KIND, Ph. D.

*Crown 8vo., cloth, pp. xlviii + 231.....75c.*

"I have endeavored in this book to meet the demands of both those teachers who prefer to conduct their classes in English and those who desire use the 'Reform Method.' Hence the introduction and notes are in English, whereas résumés, questions, and topics for review have been added in German."—From the Preface.

*Correspondence with teachers regarding this book is invited.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMERICAN BRANCH  
35 West 32nd Street, NEW YORK

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXII

FEBRUARY, 1917

NUMBER 2

## ON THE MEANING OF 'ROMANTIC' IN EARLY GERMAN ROMANTICISM

### PART II

The chief preoccupation of Friedrich Schlegel's mind during the half-dozen years preceding the earliest manifestoes of the Romantic School was the question of the nature, the relations, and the relative values, of "the ancient" and "the modern" in art. That there is some profound and significant unlikeness between the spirit, the informing idea, of classical and of modern art and taste—this was the assumption from which his earliest and most characteristic reflection upon æsthetic questions proceeded. The long essay *Über das Studium der Griechischen Poesie* (1794-5) is the outstanding illustration of the place which this antithesis had in his thought; but he could scarcely write upon any theme without giving evidence of his absorption in the problem.<sup>1</sup> There is, he declared in 1796, a sort of "civil war in the kingdom of culture"—a "Kampf des Alten und des Neuen"—and it is therefore indispensable to an understanding of the history of humanity that "the concepts of the ancient and the modern be given a definite meaning (*fixirt*) and be deduced from human nature itself."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially *Über die Grenzen des Schönen*, 1794; *Lyceum-Fragment* 84; and the following from A. W. Schlegel's Berlin lectures of 1801-4, à propos of ancient and modern poetry: "Der verschiedne Geist beyder, ja der zwischen ihnen obwaltende Gegensatz, und wie man deswegen bey ihrer Beurtheilung von anders modifizirten Prinzipien ausgehn müsse, um jede ohne Beeinträchtigung der andern anzuerkennen: diess ist einer von den Hauptpunkten den mein Bruder und ich in unsern kritischen Schriften von verschiednen Seiten her ins Licht zu setzen gesucht haben." (*Op. cit.*, III, 6, in *Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale* XIX, 6.)

<sup>2</sup> In the review of Herder's *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität*, *Jugendschriften* II, 42.

Schlegel's interest in this question, however, was not the interest of an historian but of an aesthetician. "Ancient" and "modern" expressed less a chronological than a philosophical distinction. The tendencies for which either term stood might manifest themselves, and admittedly to some extent did manifest themselves, in the period customarily denoted by the other. Schlegel's conception of "das Wesentlich-Antike," in particular, was much more the product of æsthetic theorizing than of historical inquiry; though he sincerely believed that conception to express the predominant character of Greek art, his generalizations about the ancients were so hasty and, in some points, so palpably absurd as to lend themselves very easily to Schiller's satire in the *Xenien*. When, in accord with the prevailing fashion of the time, Schlegel in his first period (1793-96) glorified ancient and belabored modern poetry, he was really engaged in formulating two antithetic critical theories, and in vindicating one of them at the expense of the other.

The antithesis, stated in more descriptive terms, was that between *die schöne Poesie* and *die interessante Poesie*, the "poetry of beauty" and the "poetry of the interesting"; or between "objectivity" and "subjectivity" as governing principles in artistic creation and æsthetic appreciation. The doctrine which Schlegel at this time held was, in essence, a sort of æsthetic rationalism. It regarded "beauty" as an "objective" attribute, which works of art do or do not possess, irrespective of their relation to the feelings and the experience of the artist, if not wholly irrespective of their relation to the feelings of the reader, hearer or beholder. An æsthetic value, to be genuine must be "of universal validity," neither expressive of, nor dependent for its effect upon, the subjective "interest" of this or that individual; and there is, or ought to be, an "allgemeingültige Wissenschaft des Geschmacks und der Kunst." The "pure" laws of beauty, therefore, are objective and universal principles, rigid and invariable. The end of art is the attainment of this beauty through fidelity to these laws; its end is *not* to imitate or emulate nature, nor yet to record the inner reactions of the artist upon nature and life. The foremost of its laws, therefore, is that of self-limitation, restriction of its themes and its modes of expression, by the exclusion both of the intrinsically ugly and of whatever is inconsistent with the

<sup>3</sup> "Pure" probably in the Kantian sense, *i. e.*, *a priori*.



rigorous unity, the clearness of outline and the singleness of total effect, of any individual work. There was in Schlegel's early æsthetic writings not a little of that smug talk about "good taste" and "technical correctness" (especially in the drama) which was later to become a favorite object of the Romanticists' ridicule.<sup>4</sup>

It is not, however, the purpose of this paper to offer any thorough exposition of the classicism of Fr. Schlegel's first period. Our concern is with his formulation of the opposite æsthetic ideal, which he at that time rejected, but with the definition of which, especially in the *Studium-Aufsatz*, he was scarcely less occupied. What I wish here to point out is that his conception of "das eigentümlich Moderne" was, in its essentials, completely formed long before the period of the *Athenaeum*, and did not materially alter when he passed from his *Gräkomane* of 1793-5, through the transitional stage of 1796, to the Romanticism of 1797 and thereafter. The "romantische Poesie" of which we hear so much after 1798 was simply the "interessante Poesie" of the earlier period. What altered was only Schlegel's valuation of this type of poetry.

In the writings of 1793-5 the principal characteristics attributed to "the distinctively modern" are these: a disposition to imitate in art the "Fülle und Leben" which are the "Vorrecht der Natur," at the expense of the unity and coherency which are the "Vorrecht der Kunst;"<sup>5</sup> a consequent inclination to over-ride all fixed laws and limits, "als wenn nicht alle Kunst beschränkt und alle Natur

<sup>4</sup> For all this, v. *Über die Grenzen des Schönen* (1794), *Von den Schulen der griechischen Poesie* (1794), *Über die weiblichen Charaktere*, usw., (1794), and especially the *Studium-Aufsatz* (1796) *passim*, in Minor's edition of Schlegel's *Jugendschriften*; also the (supposed) earlier form of the last-mentioned essay in *DNL*, vol. 143. As Alt has noted (*Schiller u. die Brüder Schlegel*, 1904), W. von Humboldt had, in *Die Horen*, 1795 (iv, 31-33), drawn the same contrast between *das Schöne* and *das Interessante*, had denied to the latter any "purely æsthetic" value, and had found a weakness for it to be a characteristic fault of modern taste.

<sup>5</sup> *Über die Grenzen des Schönen*; in Minor, *Jugendschriften* I, 23. Observe how precisely Schlegel here defines, while damning, the characteristics which he later came to regard as the essence of the Romantic temper: "Das furchtbare und doch fruchtlose Verlangen sich ins Unendliche zu verbreiten, der heisse Durst das Einzelne zu durchdringen"—these two cravings, sprung from a common source, and characteristic of the modern spirit, he now holds to be the arch-enemies of both æsthetic and moral worth.

unendlich wäre;"<sup>6</sup> a tendency to produce, not, as does ancient art, that "Befriedigung wo die kleinste Unruhe aufgelös't wird, wo alle Sehnsucht schweigt," but rather an insatiable longing;<sup>7</sup> a relative indifference to "form," to pure "beauty," in comparison with expressiveness and richness of content, and, in particular, an eagerness to catch and express, not the universal and typical (which alone is consonant with "beauty"), so much as the differentness of things, the unique and the individual—"ein subjektives Interesse an einer bestimmten *Art* von Leben, an einem individuellen Stoff;"<sup>8</sup> an especial interest in individuals of exceptional originality, or force;<sup>9</sup> a liking for the representation of the positively ugly or grotesque;<sup>10</sup> a constant confusion and intermixture of *genres*;<sup>11</sup> a fusion of philosophical with purely æsthetic interests, so that "die Philosophie poetisirt und die Poesie philosophirt;"<sup>12</sup> and a lack of æsthetic disinterestedness and detachment on the part of the artist, a tendency to use all forms of poetic utterance as means for expressing his personal attitude towards reality, instead of devoting himself to the realization of pure, "objective" beauty in the work of art which he produces.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 24.

<sup>7</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 87, 89.

<sup>8</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 91, lines 19-22; 80, ll. 34-40. For the thesis that the universal, *i. e.*, the generic, not the individual, is the object of true (and of ancient) art, cf. I, 38-9, 89, 135. This craving for the representation of "the individual" is what Schlegel means by the often mentioned *penchant* of the moderns for *das Charakteristische*. W. von Humboldt also identified a preference for "Charakter-Ausdruck" (*i. e.*, expressiveness in the representation of the individual person or situation) with that craving for the "interesting" which he lamented in modern taste, as inconsistent with a pure appreciation of *Grazie und Schönheit* (*Die Horen*, 1795, iv, 33).

<sup>9</sup> This is one of Schlegel's senses of "the interesting": "Interessant nemlich ist jedes originelle Individuum, welches ein grösseres Quantum von intellektuellem Gehalt oder ästhetischer Energie enthält" (*Jugendschriften* I, 109). Aesthetic condemnation is pronounced on this upon essentially Platonistic grounds: since such 'interestingness' involves the idea of relative magnitude and "since all magnitudes are capable of addition *ad infinitum*," there can be no such thing as a "höchstes Interessantes," *i. e.*, no fixed and absolute æsthetic standard with respect to this quality.

<sup>10</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 88, l. 39.

<sup>11</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 22, 89, 102-3, 122, 146, 150, 157.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 89.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 81, ll. 1-23, and l. 46 to p. 82, l. 17.

Describe these characteristics in rhapsodical, instead of censorious, language, and you have most of the elements of Fr. Schlegel's later characterizations of Romantic poetry, and of *das Romantische* in general: universality of interest and of theme; insatiable progression and perpetual self-transcendence; *Streben nach dem Unendlichen*; glorification of *Werden* above *Vollendung*; supreme interest in the *Selbstdarstellung des genialischen Individuums*; inclusion even of the abnormal and "monstrous" in the province of art, as elements in "universality;" demand for the *Vereinigung aller getrennten Gattungen der Poesie*; identification of philosophy with poetry; and insistence upon the unrestrained freedom of the creative artist, "der kein Gesetz über sich leide." And, in particular, you have in the earlier and disapproving accounts of *das Wesentlich-Moderne* most of the features emphasized in *Ath.-Fgm.* 116. Though that fragment at first appears to be simply a eulogy of the novel as a *genre*, the ground of the eulogy is that the novel is peculiarly capable of attaining those qualities which Schlegel had long since described as the distinguishing traits of the "essentially modern."

Not only the characteristics, but also the principal historic embodiment, of the modern ideal in poetry, are the same for Schlegel before and after his adoption of that ideal as his own. Shakespeare, we are told, in a passage already cited in Pt. I of this study, is "unter allen Künstlern derjenige, welcher den Geist der modernen Poesie am vollständigsten und am treffendsten charakterisirt." But, to Schlegel in 1795, this means that the English dramatist is, in spite of, or because of, his genius, also the most striking example of the æsthetic aberrations of modern art—of "das grosse Übergewicht des Individuellen, Charakteristischen und Philosophischen in der ganzen Masse der modernen Poesie." Shakespeare's "unerschöpfliche Fülle" Schlegel cordially recognizes; "his individuality is the most interesting thus far known." Yet any critic who treats Shakespeare's poetry "als schöne Kunst" only falls "into the deeper contradictions, the greater his penetration and the more thorough his knowledge of the poet . . . . None of Shakespeare's dramas attains beauty in its *proportions* (ist in *Masse* schön); never does the principle of beauty determine the construction of the play as a whole. And even the beauties to be found in the parts are, as in nature, seldom free from an admixture of the ugly. What is beautiful is not there for its own sake, but

as a means to quite a different end—in the interest of the expression of character or of a philosophical idea. Shakespeare is often rough and unpolished when a finer rounding-off of his material would have been easy. He is so precisely for the sake of this superior interest. Not seldom his abundance means inextricable confusion, and the result of the whole is an endless conflict. It cannot even be said that he presents us truth in its purity. He gives us only a one-sided view of truth, even though it be the broadest and most comprehensive. His representation is never objective, but always personal,<sup>14</sup> an expression of his individuality.”<sup>15</sup> Even the greatest plays of Shakespeare exhibit the characteristic faults of modern art. Thus, *e. g.*, *Romeo and Juliet* exemplifies the “unnatürliche Mischung der reinen Dichtarten,” for it belongs to the class of modern dramas which may be called “lyrical”—not in the sense that they contain lyrical passages, but in the more significant sense that the poems themselves, while dramatic in form, are in essence merely “die dramatische Aeussierung einer lyrischen Begeisterung.” *Romeo and Juliet* is “but a romantic sigh over the transiency of the joy of youth.” The very excellence of the execution merely makes the more evident the “Monstrosität der Gattung.”<sup>16</sup> Even *Hamlet*, “masterpiece of artistic sagacity” though it is, is yet only an unbeautiful picture of the complete disharmony of a human soul: “der Totaleindruck dieser Tragödie ist ein Maximum der Verzweiflung.” It is thus the best example of a “philosophical tragedy,” which is “the exact contrary to the æsthetic tragedy.” For the latter, which is “die Vollendung der schönen Poesie,” has “for its final outcome the highest harmony.”<sup>17</sup>

While Shakespeare in 1794-5 still represented for Schlegel the perversion of modern taste, even in a writer of the highest gifts, Goethe was then the object of the critic's supreme reverence and the ground of hope of a return to sound æsthetic principles and

<sup>14</sup> *Manierirt*: the word, as Schlegel's definition shows, has for him this sense.

<sup>15</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 109; cf. also 107, I. 30.

<sup>16</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 102-3.

<sup>17</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 106-108. Alt (*Schiller u. die Brüder Schlegel*, p. 18) strangely refers to this passage as evidence that Schlegel at this period was “far removed from a disparagement of modern poetry”! For Schlegel's later recantation of precisely these strictures upon Shakespeare, see *Ath.-Fgm.*, 253.

practice. But it was, be it noted, a Goethe who had not yet published *Wilhelm Meister*, and who was praised wholly for his 'classical' qualities—for his "serenity," his "balance," his "objectivity," his "nearness to the Greeks," his freedom from the usual modern over-valuation of *das Interessante*. "Goethe's poetry is the dawn of genuine art and of pure beauty . . . His works are an irrefutable proof that the objective is actually possible." In the values that belong to *die charakteristische Poesie* he is perhaps surpassed by Shakespeare. But it is not at such inferior values that he aims: "das Schöne ist der wahre Massstab, seine liebenswürdige Dichtung zu würdigen." Thus the time is ripe for a general æsthetic revolution, which shall bring to an end "die Herrschaft des Interessanten, Charakteristischen und Manierirten," and renew the felicity already attained by Greek art, when—through a happy instinct, rather than by formulated principles—the laws of unity, balance, measure, of pure beauty, still ruled the practice of the artist.<sup>18</sup> ✓

In 1798, when Schlegel has become a professed Romanticist, it is still Shakespeare who represents most fully the (now admired) characteristics of modern poetry. Thus in *Ath.-Fgm.* 247, he, Dante, and Goethe make up "der grosse Dreiklang der modernen Poesie"; and while Dante's "prophetic poem" is "the highest of its kind," and Goethe's "rein poetische Poesie ist die vollständigste Poesie der Poesie," it is Shakespeare's "universality" which is "wie der Mittelpunkt der romantischen Kunst." It is not even true that (as Haym implies) in the essay on *Wilhelm Meister* Goethe figures as the sole or the supreme representative of the critic's new ideal of poetic excellence. When—remarks Schlegel—Goethe reaches the climax of his *Bildungsroman*, the point at which both his hero and his readers are to be enabled "das Höchste und das Tiefste zu fassen," he finds in Shakespeare the "grosstes Vorbild" which he needs for this purpose; "for what poet could better serve for this, than he who preëminently deserves to be called the Infinite?"<sup>19</sup> No language quite so exalted is used of Goethe in the essay. His place here, relatively to Shakespeare, is the same as that which had already been indicated in the first number of the *Athenaeum* by A. W. Schlegel—whose *Beiträge zur Kritik der neuesten Litteratur*, in that number, constituted, it must be remem-

<sup>18</sup> *Jugendschriften* I, 114-116.

<sup>19</sup> The reference is, of course, to Goethe's interpretations of Hamlet.



bered, the initial manifesto of "the new school." For Shakespeare, we there are told, Goethe has become "ein neues Medium der Erkenntniss; so dass von beyden gemeinschaftlich eine Dichterschule ausgehn kann." It is in having given to the new age a sense of Shakespeare's true meaning and value that a great part, if not the chief part, of Goethe's epoch-making significance is represented as consisting. In 1800, again, we have found the younger Schlegel describing Shakespeare as "das eigentliche Centrum, der Kern der romantischen Fantasie"—in the passage which constitutes the principal formal definition of "romantisch," the word here being expressly declared to be a synonym of "modern, in contrast with the classical poetry of antiquity."<sup>20</sup>

Thus Friedrich Schlegel had the conception of 'the Romantic' in art before him from the first, both in abstract formulation and in its concrete embodiment in Shakespeare. The heart of his earlier æsthetic doctrine lies in a phrase already cited: alle Kunst ist beschränkt. But over against this 'classical' ideal he had already clearly conceived of an art to which the limitations of the supposed unchanging "laws of objective æsthetic validity" were intolerable: an art more enamored of life than of beauty; content to take nothing less than everything for its province; resolved to possess and to express the entire range of human experience; more interested in the individual variant than in the generic type; sensible that the abundance and infinite interconnectedness of Nature are incom-

<sup>20</sup> *Athenæum*, III, 122; *Jugendschriften* II, 372. As a further illustration of the supremacy of Shakespeare in the poetic hierarchy recognized by the early Romanticists, and also as evidence upon their general conception of 'Romantic' poetry, it is worth while to cite Tieck's prospectus of his *Poetisches Journal*, at the end of the original edition of his *Romantische Dichtungen* (1799-1800): "Mein Hauptzweck wird sein, meine Gedanken über Kunst und Poesie . . . zu entwickeln. Sie werden sich daher vornehmlich an die Werke der anerkannt grössten Dichter der Neuern anknüpfen, von denen meine Betrachtungen immer ausgehn. So werden z. B. Briefe über Shakespeare einen stehenden Artikel in jedem Stücke ausmachen . . . worin ich . . . mich in historische und kritische Untersuchungen einlassen werde, die über die Werke dieses unerschöpflichen und immer noch nicht genug verstandenen Geistes Licht verbreiten können. Ähnliche Aufsätze über die ältere Englische und Deutsche und die glänzenden Perioden der Spanischen und Italiänischen Litteratur sollen damit in Verbindung gesetzt werden und nach und nach ein Gemälde der ächten modernen Poesie (nicht dessen was so oft dafür ausgegeben worden ist) darstellen."

patible with any sharp cleavage of things from one another, and not more afraid of "confusion" than Nature is; aware that the distinctiveness, the idiosyncrasy, of the individual artist's vision is one of the elements in this abundance of Nature, and ought therefore not to be suppressed in art; and mindful that the task which it thus sets before itself is endless, and that no stage reached in the progress of it can be definitive.<sup>21</sup>

The genesis of Romanticism, then, is very seriously misconceived, when it is supposed (as by Haym and many others after him) that the conception of "Romantic poetry" was formed by Schlegel only about 1796 or later; that he "abstracted it from *Wilhelm Meister*"; that it implied a sort of apotheosis of the novel among the literary *genres*; and that Schlegel's first elucidation of it was in the *Athenaeum* in 1798. The theory of Romanticism was, so to say, a by-product of the prevalent classicism of the early seventeenth-nineties. Desiring to define more clearly what they conceived to be the spirit and the ruling principles of the ancient art which they revered, several philosophical aestheticians of the period were led to define at the same time, with equal fullness, the spirit and ruling principles of the opposite of that art, to elaborate a theory of *das eigentümlich Moderne*. The result was that some of them—Fr. Schlegel notably, but not he only—presently transferred their alle-

<sup>21</sup> This conception—the original Schlegelian conception—of Romantic poetry, as reproducing the *Fülle des Lebens*, and consequently as characterized above all by universality and expressiveness, was shared by Novalis: "Der Romantiker studirt das Leben, wie der Maler, Musiker und Mechaniker Farbe, Ton und Kraft. Sorgfältiges Studium des Lebens macht den Romantiker, wie sorgfältiges Studium von Farbe, Gestaltung, Ton und Kraft, den Maler, Musiker und Mechaniker." "Je persönlicher, localer, temporeller, eigenthümlicher ein Gedicht ist, desto näher steht es dem Centro der Poesie" (*Schriften*, 1837, II, 224-5).

The program of such a Romanticism, which aims at the portrayal of what Schlegel called *das Charakteristische*, has manifestly much in common with realism, but is differentiated by the place which it, with some inconsistency, gives to the "subjectivity" of the poet. Novalis, however, was chiefly responsible for introducing a very different conception of 'the Romantic'—due partly to the influence of certain older, popular senses of the word—whereby it signifies 'the remote', 'the strange', 'the ill-defined': "in der Entfernung wird alles romantisch" (*ibid.*, p. 221; cf. also p. 236). The common element in the two conceptions was the notion of 'the infinite' as the object of art—this notion coming, through a confused association of ideas, to be taken in two highly antithetic senses.

giance to that which they had at first studied chiefly in order that they might the better condemn it. Grown accustomed to its dreadful face, they ended by embracing it. By 1798 Fr. Schlegel had for nearly five years been discussing Romantic poetry—under another name. And he can not have derived from *Wilhelm Meister* a conception with which he was entirely familiar before he had read that romance.<sup>22</sup> What befell in 1796 was neither the discovery, nor the invention, of the Romantic doctrine of art by Fr. Schlegel, but merely his conversion to it.

Who, or what, was the means of grace chiefly instrumental to that conversion? Upon an adequate discussion of this question I cannot, for lack of space, here enter. I must be content to say, without argument, that in the case of one famous writing published in 1795-6 there is conclusive evidence of its immediate and powerful effect in the alteration of Schlegel's æsthetic opinions; and that this writing was not *Wilhelm Meister* but Schiller's essay *Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*.<sup>23</sup> Schiller here offered a vindication of the moderns upon principles peculiarly adapted to impress Fr. Schlegel—principles which, in fact, became the basis of his subsequent conviction of the superiority of 'Romantic' art. But Schlegel's æsthetic theory had from the first been in a state of unstable equilibrium; only a slight impulsion was needed to turn it upside down. The limitations of 'classicism' were uncongenial to his temperament; and it is frequently manifest—especially in

<sup>22</sup> The essay *Über die Grenzen des Schönen* was finished by April, 1795; that *Über das Studium usw.* was begun in the spring of 1794, finished by December, 1795, but not published until 1797. The footnote referring to *Wilhelm Meister* (*Jugendschriften* I, 106) is evidently a later addition. The earlier form of this essay (*Vom Wert des Studiums der Griechen u. Römer*, first printed in *DNL*, 143) was completed by July, 1794; I am not, however, convinced that the *DNL* Text is identical with the original. *Wilhelm Meister* appeared in parts, 1795-6. The first mention of it in Friedrich's letters to his brother is under date of June 16, 1795; the elder brother had not then seen the book.

<sup>23</sup> Especially the first two parts, published in the *Horen* at the end of 1795. The decisive importance of this essay in Schlegel's philosophical development has already been emphasized by Enders (*Friedrich Schlegel*, 1913, pp. 259-263) and Walzel (*Deutsche Romantik*, 1908, pp. 29-31; cf. also his "Schiller als Romantiker" in *Vom Geistesleben des 18. u. 19. Jahrhunderts*). To the arguments presented by these writers I had hoped to add something in this paper, but the attempt must be postponed to another occasion.

the passages on Shakespeare—that the youthful critic secretly admired much that he felt obliged by the rigor of his creed to condemn. Not only was his nature thus out of harmony with his doctrine; his doctrine was also out of harmony with itself. It contained from the beginning explicit theses or definite admissions—derived largely from Kant—which were, though he was not yet aware of the fact, incongruous with the sort of æsthetic gospel that he was then so ardently preaching. But the analysis of these ‘internal strains’ in Schlegel’s pre-Romantic philosophy of art must also be deferred to some other occasion.

It remains only, in conclusion, to bring all this to bear upon the semasiological question propounded at the beginning of this study. We have seen that the Romantic æsthetics was formulated, I will not say altogether clearly, but about as clearly as it ever was, before the word ‘romantic’ was definitely chosen as its designation, and also before the doctrine itself was adopted by its formulator. What Schlegel meant by the “romantische Poesie” which he extolled after 1797 was, as has been shown, in all essentials the same thing as he had meant by “interessante Poesie” in 1794-6, *viz.*, the qualities and tendencies which he conceived to be distinctive of modern literature. It can not, therefore, be held (in spite of the apparent testimony of *Ath.-Fgm.* 166 in favor of Haym’s view), that the term “romantische Poesie” primarily signified either “Romanpoesie” or “romanartige Poesie,” or that it contained an implicit reference to *Wilhelm Meister* as the typical romantic book. It signified from the first, as both Schlegels in their eventual explanations of it testified, “eine eigentümlich moderne, nicht nach den Mustern des Altertums gebildete Poesie,” together with the ideals and æsthetic values which they believed to be alien to the spirit of ancient art.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See Pt. I of this article, *MLN*, xxxi, 389-392. Note also the language of A. W. Schlegel when, in 1809, he offered a retrospective summary of the original aims of the Romantic School. He has been speaking of the barrenness of the so-called ‘classical’ period of modern literature; and continues: “So ungefähr standen die Sachen immerfort, bis vor nicht langer Zeit, einige, besonders Deutsche Denker, versuchten . . . zugleich die Alten nach Gebühr zu ehren, und dennoch die davon gänzlich abweichende Eigenthümlichkeit der Neuern anzuerkennen. . . . Diese haben für den eigenthümlichen Geist der modernen Kunst den Namen ‘romantisch’ erfunden” (*SW.*, 1846, v, p. 9).

But it may still be asked: given this as the meaning to be expressed, why should 'romantisch' have been the word chosen to express it? The answer is not difficult. *Modern* would not do, because it suggested a merely chronological distinction, whereas, as we have seen, much more than a chronological distinction was intended. The earlier antithesis *schön vs. interessant* would hardly serve, after Schlegel's change of view, since to most ears it would imply a depreciation of precisely the kind of poetry which he now regarded as the higher. In 1796, in a typically transitional writing, we find him formally urging the adoption of the words "objectiv" and "interessant" as "new technical terms" to distinguish the Sophoclean from the Shakespearean type of tragedy.<sup>25</sup> This proposal soon fell to the ground. Even *interessant*, one may conjecture was open to two objections. While *modern* had too exclusively chronological a connotation, *interessant* had no chronological connotation at all; and it had acquired, through its use by Schlegel himself and by W. von Humboldt, a distinctly dyslogistic coloring. Meanwhile, there lay ready at hand a word, as it seemed, ideally adapted to convey the conception present to Fr. Schlegel's mind. 'Romantisch' had hitherto chiefly meant for the Schlegels (as has been shown in the former part of this study) not, indeed, 'modern' in general, but 'post-classical,' including specifically both the medieval and the early modern. It thus, even in its purely historical or chronological sense, was better fitted than *modern* to express one side of the æsthetic antithesis now in question; for it was in the Middle Ages and in the earlier modern period that the qualities which Schlegel had defined as antithetic to the classical were best represented, while the later modern centuries had been characterized by pseudo-classical revivals and other deviations from type. In particular, *romantisch* was from the first associated in Fr. Schlegel's mind with Dante, Cervantes and Shakespeare; and as we have seen, it was these, especially the last, who, both before and after Schlegel's change of view, were to him the typical representatives of *die interessante Poesie*, of *das Wesentlich-Moderne*. Above all, *romantisch* had a less fixedly chronological import than *modern*, and was therefore more capable of connoting certain æsthetic characteristics, the exclusively modern origin of which was a significant but not the essential fact. Thus no other single word could,

<sup>25</sup> In the *Vorrede* to *Die Griechen u. Römer; Jugendschriften* I, 83.



from the point of view of Schlegel's own usage, express so well as *romantisch* precisely what he wished to convey. In view of these considerations, we have every reason for regarding, not only the meaning given to *romantisch* by the Schlegels in 1799 and thereafter as the original meaning, but also the grounds then assigned for their selection of the word as the original grounds. Haym's long-current explanation of the signification and origin of the term, as well as the usual account of the genesis of the idea, must accordingly be rejected. Only—one must add, in order to make Haym's error intelligible—it is true that the adjective continued to have at times, for Fr. Schlegel, some obscure association with the noun *Roman*, in a sense of the latter which included the novel as well as the medieval romances; and that in the characterization of *die romantische Poesie* in *Ath.-Fgm.* 116, this association of ideas—either through confusion or, as one suspects, through a desire to mystify his readers—is made conspicuous. But even in this passage, as we have already seen, Schlegel is only secondarily expatiating upon the possibilities of the *Roman* as a *genre*; he is primarily setting forth, as he had often before set forth, the æsthetic aims and temper which to him differentiated truly modern from classical art.

A. O. LOVEJOY.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

#### THE OLD ENGLISH POEMS ON ST. GUTHLAC AND THEIR LATIN SOURCE

All scholars agree that the 1353 verses in the Exeter Book concerning St. Guthlac form two distinct poems, the first running from 1 to 790 and the second from 791 to 1353. There is less unanimity of opinion, however, with regard to the question as to whether both parts were based on the *Vita* of the saint by Felix.<sup>1</sup> No one denies that the second part, which we may designate as *Guthlac's Death*, depends upon the *Vita*; but such a relationship has been thought by some not to exist for the first poem, which we may call *Guthlac the Hermit*. Since I have, myself, been guilty of expressing conflict-

<sup>1</sup> Ed. A. S. S., Apr. II, 38-49.

ing views with regard to the matter,<sup>2</sup> I wish to present the evidence on which I base my later conclusions. I believe it will be worth while, furthermore, to examine the relationship between *Guthlac's Death* and the *Vita*, since a comparison between the two is illuminating with regard to the poet's method and has its importance with reference to the question of his identity.

#### I. GUTHLAC THE HERMIT

To pass in review the opinions that have been expressed for and against the dependence of *Guthlac the Hermit* upon Felix would profit us not at all. I must, however, refer to Dr. Forstmann's study, published in 1902, since it is the most recent treatment of the subject, and since it was the means of misleading me for a time by its genuine erudition and its mistaken reasoning. Dr. Forstmann submitted the poem to a close comparison with the text of Felix, and came to the conclusions, (1) that the one was entirely independent of the other; and (2) that the few correspondences noted were due to treatment of the same material or to dependence on a similar source (p. 17). He decided, that is, that the poet drew on oral tradition for his information about the saint.

Dr. Forstmann was misled, I think, by a mistake of method very natural in a young scholar. He compared the poem with the *Vita*, not the *Vita* with the poem. That is, he did not set about investigating whether the *Vita* was the source of the poem, but whether the two ran parallel through their whole course. Thus when passages of the Latin text were omitted, Dr. Forstmann remarked that of these matters there is in the poem "so gut wie gar nichts." On the other hand, he was disturbed by expansions of the Latin by the poet. In other words, he failed to see that in weighing the possible dependence of a poem on a prose source, one must grant a certain latitude of imagination and of phrasing to its author: he would scarcely be a true poet if he merely translated his original, sentence by sentence, into verse.

Let us see, first, what correspondences and what divergences

<sup>2</sup> In a review in *Engl. Stud.*, xxxiv, 95 ff., of H. Forstmann, *Untersuchungen zur Guthlac-Legende*, Bonner Beiträge, xii, 1-40; and in *Saints' Legends*, 1916, pp. 79-85, where I had not space to present my evidence in detail.

there are between the *Vita* and the poem. After doing this, we shall be in a position to discuss the question in its general bearings.

1-63. These lines form a prologue, for which there is no parallel in Felix's preface. The latter is short and refers wholly to the composition of the work that is to follow. Obviously the poet did not draw upon this source for his somewhat elaborate contrast between the evil times and evil deeds of the world and the lives of the saints, which ends by celebrating hermits more particularly. Yet that he had a literary model seems to me almost certain from the fact that the passage runs along lines sufficiently familiar to anyone who has read much medieval literature. Indeed, 1-8a might almost be taken from Gregory of Tours' *Vita Patrum*, where is found a close parallel at least.<sup>3</sup> "Multi varique sunt gradus per quos ad coelorum regna conscenditur, de quibus, ut opinor, et David dicit, quia *ascensus in corde deposuit*. Accipiuntur ergo hi gradus diversorum operum ad cultum divinum profectus, et nullus in his gressum figere potest, nisi fuerit, sicut sæpe testati sumus, Dei adjutorio provocatus." Gregory goes on to say that this aid is ready for anyone who will seek for it "per hos ergo scalæ hujus ascensus tam difficiles, tamque excelsos, tam arduos," ending the prologue he is writing by the remark that St. Friardus, his hero for the moment, sought this aid. The same figure is used by Lactantius:<sup>4</sup> "Nam cum sint gradus multi per quos ad domicilium veritatis ascenditur, non est facile cuilibet evehi ad summum." I am not arguing that the poet of *Guthlac the Hermit* had read Gregory of Tours, but only that he was writing in a vein of literary tradition. There is even the possibility that he used a copy of Felix's *Vita* with a prologue unlike the one extant, but resembling in content the prologue of the Old English poem. We know very little about the textual history of Felix, but we do know that double prologues were not unusual in such works.

64-111 tell how Guthlac, deserting the evil courses of his youth, turned to God. There is then described the battle between the angel of the Lord and the devil for his soul. In § 11 of Felix a similar struggle is pictured, though it is represented as taking place wholly in the saint's mind. In view, however, of the personification used later in the *Vita* and of the poet's constant tendency to

<sup>3</sup> Cap. x. Migne, *Patr. Curs. Comp. Lat.* LXXI, 1055.

<sup>4</sup> *De ira dei*, 2, ed. Brandt, 1893, p. 69.

dramatize, it is quite natural that he should depict this scene as he does. The passage is freely rendered, that is all.

111b-124 describe in general terms the terrors and temptations that beset Guthlac, and picture his dwelling-place in the Fens and its former devilish occupants. In §§ 14-16 of Felix we have the situation, conditions, and surroundings of Crowland explicitly stated. These paragraphs the poet has used freely. Corresponding rather closely to 117b-120:

Wæs sēo londes stōw  
bimīpen fore monnum,      oþþæt meotud onwrað  
beorȝ on bearwe,      þā se bytla ewōm,  
se þær hāligne      hām arāerde,

are the following sentences in § 14:

"Ipse autem imperiis viri Dei annuens, arrepta piscatoria scaphula, per inuia lustra, inter tetrae paludis margines, Christo viatore ad praedictam insulam, quae lingua Anglorum Cruland vocatur, pervenit, quae ante propter remotioris eremi solitudinem inculta et ignota manebat. Nullus hanc ante famulum Christi Guthlacum solus habitare colonus valebat, propter videlicet illic demorantium daemonum phantasias."

124b-140 tell how Guthlac was tempted after he had renounced earthly joys "in ȝemyndiȝra monna tīdum," who report his fame and the revelations he received, as well as the words he spoke. The first part of this passage corresponds to the beginning of § 16, where Felix states that he had his information from Wilfrid and Cissa, who are also mentioned in the prologue. 129b-130a, "þā hē āna ȝesæt dȳȝle stōwe," correspond to the end of § 14, where it is said that Guthlac "inter umbrosa solitudinis nemora solus habitare coepit." 134b-140:

þæt hē his lichoman  
wynna forwyrnde      ond woruldblissa,  
sēftra setla      ond symbeldaȝa  
swylce ēac idelra      ēaȝena wynna,  
ȝierelan ȝielplices.      Him wæs ȝodes eȝsa  
māra in ȝemyndum,      þonne hē menniscum  
brymme æfter þonce      þeȝan wolde.

These lines revert to sentences in § 11, where the saint's conversion is pictured. Compare, for instance: "Ita enim in illo divinae gratiae inflammatio flagrabat, ut non solum regalis indolentiae reverentiam despiceret, sed parentes et patriam comitesque adolescentiae suae contempsit."

141-152a tell how Guthlac bore in his soul divine hope, how he had an angel guardian, took up spiritual arms, and raised a cross. Something more than suggestions for the lines is to be found in § 15 of Felix, where St. Bartholomew's day is mentioned, "*in cujus suffragio omnia incepta eremi habitandi ex divina providentia inchoaverat*"; and where, after one intervening sentence, we are told: "*Deinde præcinctus spiritualibus armis adversus teterrimi hostis insidias, scutum fidei, lorica spei, galeam castitatis, arcum patientiæ, sagittas psalmodiæ, sese in acie firmans, arripuit.*"

152b-185. God gave Guthlac the victory when throngs of devils with darts came against him; in temptation help was near, though his enemies threatened him with burning if he did not return to his kindred. He did not fear, and put his adversaries to shame. In their anger they said that he caused them misery by his pride in taking up his dwelling in the place that had been their retreat. This passage is based on §§ 17, 18, and 19, not being so much a narrative of any particular temptation described by Felix as a general exposition of the saint's trials. 156b-157,

þonne menzu cwōm  
fēonda fārscytum      fēhðe rāran,

recall Guthlac's adventure with the devil with a bow, in § 17. 161-175 refer to the adventure in which he was threatened by devils with the fires of Hell, which is found in § 19. Vv. 176-185 seem to be based, rather, on § 18, where the devils compare the saint to the prophets and to Christ—to his disadvantage—and lament when put to flight.

186-298. This long section describes the sorrow of the devils at being dispossessed of their place of retreat. With lamentations they threatened Guthlac with future torment, but they were beaten off by his faith. The passage is clearly an expansion of the end of § 19 in Felix:

"*Deinde cum solito more matutinas laudes Domino Jesu impenderet, paullisper lumina devertens, a sinistra stantes duos satellites lugentes, sibi præ ceteris aliis notos, conspicit: quos cum interrogasset quid plorassent, responderunt: Vires nostras ubique per te fractas lugemus, et inertiam nostram adversus valetudinem tuam ploramus: non enim te tangere, aut tibi appropinquare audemus. Hæc dicentes, velut fumus a facie ejus evanuerunt.*"

299-382 give a very general account of Guthlac's life and his



temptations: how he often said to the demons that he would remain steadfast despite all their efforts. I take it that this is a poetical exposition of part of § 19 in Felix, again. Compare vv. 319-326a.

Symle h̄ 3ūðlāc	in 3odes willan
fromne fundon,	bonne flyzerēowe
þurh nihta 3enipu	nēosan cwōman,
þā þe onhāle	cardas weredon,
hwæpre him þæs won3es	wyn sweðrade:
woldun, þæt him tō mōde	fore monlufan
sor3 3esohte,	þæt hē sīþ tu3e
eft tō ēþle.	

with the following: "Inter hæc cum magnam partem umbrosæ noctis in illis afflictionibus exigebant, sistere illum paullisper fecerunt, imperantes sibi ut de eremo discederet."

383-483. This long passage gives the saint's vision of the corrupt monasteries. There is nothing like it in Felix. This curious state of affairs exists, however: the vision of Hell in § 19 of Felix begins with the statement that the devils drew Guthlac into the heights of the air, while the similar vision in the poem (529-704) does not have this detail mentioned till the very end. The vision of the monasteries, however, is introduced by the poet by precisely this detail. There are two possible explanations of the matter, I think, and only two. Either the entire vision of the monasteries was an addition of the poet's from oral tradition, which he embellished by a single detail from Felix; or he used a different text of Felix from the one we possess. In favor of the latter theory, there is this to be said: our knowledge of the textual history of the *Vita*, as I have suggested above, is by no means clear. It is certainly more reasonable that the saint should be carried aloft to view the wickedness of earth than to gaze into the jaws of Hell.

484-528. This passage is general poetic exposition of Guthlac's life and virtues, for which no special parallel appears but for which the whole *Vita* would have furnished the material.

529-704. This is Guthlac's vision of Hell. Anyone who will compare with it the following passage, from § 19 of Felix, will recognize that the poet followed his source as closely as was consistent with imaginative development of the theme. There are, indeed, many similarities of phrase between the two that make the relationship satisfactorily plain. The poet expanded the account, but nevertheless followed the original step by step.

"Conjunctis itaque in unum turmis, cum immenso clamore leves in auras iter vertentes, supra memoratum Christi famulum Guthlacum ad nefandas Tartari fauces usque perducunt. Ille vero fumigantes aestuantis inferni catervas prospectans, omnia tormenta quæ prius a malignis spiritibus perpessus est, tamquam non ipse pateretur, obliviscebatur: non solum enim fluctuantium ignivomos gurgites illic turgescere cerneret, imo etiam sulphureos glaciali grandine mistos vortices, globosis sparginibus sidera pene tangentes videbantur: maligni vero inter favillantium voraginum atras cavernas discurrentes, miserabili fatu animas iniquorum diversis cruciatum generibus torquebant. Igitur vir Dei Guthlacus, cum innumera-biles tormentorum species horresceret, satellitum sibi, velut uno ex ore, turmæ clamabant, dicentes: Ecce nobis potestas data est te trudere in has pœnas, et illic in atrocissimarum gehennarum tormento variis cruciatibus nobis te torquere commissum est. En ignis, quem in delictis tuis accendisti, te consumere paratus est; en tibi patulis hiatibus igniflua erebi ostia patescunt; nunc stygiæ fibræ te vorare volunt, tibi quoque æstivi Acherontis voragines horrendis faucibus hiscunt. Sed illis hæc et alia plurima his similia dicentibus, vir Dei minas eorum despiciens, immotis sensibus, stabili animo, sobria mente respondens, aiebat: Væ vobis filii tenebrarum, semen Cain, favilla cineris. Si vestræ potentiæ sit istis me tradere pœnis, en præsto sum: ut quid falsivomis pectoribus vanas minas depromitis? Illis vero veluti ad trudendum illum in præsentium tormentorum gehennas sese præcingentibus, ecce S. Bartholomæus, cum immenso cœlestis lucis splendore, medias furvæ noctis infuso lumine interrumpens tenebras, sese ab æthereis sedibus radiantis olympi coram illis, aureo fulgore amictus, obtulit. Maligni vero spiritus, non sustinentes cœlestis splendoris fulgorem, frendere, tremere, fugere, timere cœperunt. Sanctus vero Guthlacus, adventum fidelissimi auxiliatoris sui persentiens, spiritali lætitia gavisus est. Tunc deinde S. Batholomæus catervis satellitum jubet, ut illum in locum suum cum magna quietudine, sine ulla offensionis molestia, reducerent. Nec mora, præceptis Apostolicis obtemperantes, dicto citius jussa facessunt. Nam illum revehentes cum magna suavitate, velut quietissimo alarum remigio, ita ut nec in curru nec in navi modestius duci potuisset, subvolabant."

704b-744 tell how Guthlac was greeted by the birds, which he fed and took into his hands. Comments upon this follow. The whole is undoubtedly based on § 24 of the *Vita*, which differs mainly by mentioning the subjection of fish as well as birds to the saint's holiness. I need not quote the Latin, I think.

745-761 give the death of Guthlac and his heavenly reward. They are based on § 35 of *Felix*, but recount the facts without detail. This brevity is consistent with the purpose of the poem,

of course, for it deals with the life of the saint in the Fens rather than with the glories of his transit to eternity. To another poem, and, I believe, to another poet was left the whole story of his death.

762-790 form a lyrical epilogue in praise of holy men. They are based, I think, on § 38 of Felix. In the Latin, to be sure, the praise concerns Guthlac alone; but it has the same manner as the poet's glorification of the "hūsulweras, cempa ꝥecorene," by which he rounds out his picture of the particular saint.

The foregoing comparison will have shown, I hope, that *Guthlac the Hermit* is certainly dependent upon the *Vita* for its substance, though by no means for its form. The poet could have got from it all his material except for the prologue (1-63) and for the vision of the monasteries (383-483). These two passages are not sufficient to overbalance the remainder of the evidence. They are, besides, open to the suspicion of dependence upon a text of Felix different from any now extant. The poet used his source freely, selecting what he would and when he would; omitting, condensing, or expanding as seemed to him best.

We must now consider the statements of the poet that have been taken to mean that he based his work on oral tradition. There are four of them scattered through the poem.

Hwæt! wē hȳrdon oft,	þæt se hālgā wer	
in þā ærestan	ældu ȝelufade	
frēcnessa fela.		(79-81)
	Hē ȝecostad wearð	
in ȝemyndȝra	monna tīdum.	(124-5)
se ān ōretta	ūssum tīdum	
cempa ȝecȳðeð,		(372-3)
Hwæt! wē þissa wundra	ȝewitan sindon:	
eall þās ȝeēodon	in ūssera	
tīda tīman.		(724-6)

These passages are exceedingly interesting as perhaps marking the poet's sense that he was doing something unusual—as he was—in taking a native saint as his hero. They clearly indicate that he did not think of Guthlac as someone far removed from his own day. We need not take literally, however, the statements that Guthlac "was tempted in times that men remember" and that "we are witnesses of these wonders." The poet was but recalling, after all, the references of Felix to his informants, and making evident his own place in the line of tradition. Even if it be true

that he had "heard often" about the saint's wild youth, he would not have been any the less likely to use a convenient Latin *Vita* as the basis for his poem.

It must be remembered that Felix himself was by no means without literary forbears. Although we need not doubt that he wrote at a time when Guthlac was still remembered, and that he obtained information from Wilfrid, Cissa, and Beccel as he said, we have been shown of late that he took whole paragraphs from Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti*. Dr. Gonser, who has demonstrated this,<sup>5</sup> has also remarked that Felix had as models such writers as Sulpicius Severus, Rufinus, and Gregory the Great. He might have said, also, that Bede's account of Cuthbert was by no means a wholly original work, based as it was on an earlier *Vita* by an anonymous monk of Lindisfarne. I have already indicated that the prologue of the life of St. Friardus by Gregory of Tours has a passage resembling the beginning of *Guthlac the Hermit*; I should add that that whole life belongs in the same class of Latin legends as the lives by Bede and Felix. It is not, indeed, unlikely that the *Vita S. Guthlaci* was a mosaic, pieced together by Felix from various sources to fit the circumstances of the special case. Such a procedure would have seemed a quite proper and normal thing to any writer of the time.

All this has an important bearing on *Guthlac the Hermit*. Felix wrote a rhetorically elaborate *Vita*, based in part on oral tradition but to a considerable extent on literary sources, towards the middle of the eighth century.<sup>6</sup> He was already at one remove from the saint. Subsequently—how long afterwards we cannot tell—an Old English poet fashioned his verses from material that he got from Felix. Even though he regarded himself, in the excitement of composition, as being of the same "tīd" with Guthlac, he was working at two removes from his subject. He was not weaving the raw stuff of life into poetry any more than was Cynewulf in the *Elene*.

Furthermore, though we may deeply regret it, we must be con-

<sup>5</sup> Paul Gonser, *Das angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des hl. Guthlac*, 1909 (*Anglistische Forschungen* 27), pp. 10-14.

<sup>6</sup> See Liebermann, "Ueber ostenglische Geschichtsquellen," *Neues Arch. der Gesell. f. ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xviii, 245-6; and Gonser, work cited, pp. 18-20. Note that Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* was not written till about 720.

tent not to regard *Guthlac the Hermit* as a poem which can be definitely dated. It has been set down, of late, as surely belonging about the middle of the eighth century,<sup>7</sup> but for reasons that I have tried to show are fallacious. The poem, as a matter of fact, allies itself in method and style to the group we call Cynewulfian, and it may well have been the work of a contemporary or follower of that great master.

## II. GUTHLAC'S DEATH

In considering the relationship of *Guthlac's Death* to the *Vita* by Felix, one has in mind a different problem from that relating to *Guthlac the Hermit*. No one denies that 791-1353 were based on the *Vita*; but there is great interest in scrutinizing the nature of this dependence. The poem so insistently recalls the signed work of Cynewulf, by the general impression it makes, that one welcomes any test whatsoever of the truth or falsity of the attribution. The question can scarcely be settled by considering the way the Latin source has been used, but it may be clarified. The test may help us at least to understand what basis there is for the feeling that the poem is similar to those signed by Cynewulf.

To begin with, the entire 563 verses of *Guthlac's Death* are based—except for one passage—on a single chapter of the *Vita* and, indeed, on a single section of that chapter (Cap. v, § 35) as printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Material now contained in a page, folio, sufficed the poet for the whole story.

791-850. This prologue of lyrical fervor, reviewing the creation of the world and the coming of death through the sin of Adam and Eve, is an expansion of only nine lines in the *Vita*, which say merely that all men, of whatever state, must die, since death came with Adam. The hint is given by the Latin—the rest is the poet's own.

850b-904 give a brief review of Guthlac's life and fame: his temptations by devils, his relations with the birds, and the visits paid him by the sick of body or soul. The passage renders the poem independent of *Guthlac the Hermit*. It is, of course, an epitome of certain features of the life of the saint as found in the earlier chapters of Felix.

<sup>7</sup> For example, see Brandl, *Paul's Grundriss*, II, 1034; and Morsbach, *Nachrichten der Gesell. der Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Phil-hist. Kl. 1906, pp. 273-4.



904b-953. This passage, which tells of the approach of death to Guthlac, is based on the thirteen lines of the *Vita* that immediately follow those from which 791-850 were expanded.

953b-969 revert to the theme of 791-850, and play upon it in another way.

969b-983 narrate the visit of Guthlac's disciple. The poet, omitting one sentence in Felix that immediately follows the source of 904b-953, expands between six and seven lines of his original. He does not mention the name of the "ombehtþegn," Beccelinus.

983b-995. These verses are an expansion of the question asked by Beccelinus as soon as he entered the cell: "Domine mi, quid novi tibi accidit? an forte nocte hac ulla infirmitatis molestia te tetigit?" The art with which the poet has developed the simple inquiry compels admiration. The expansion is at once clever and imaginatively just.

996-1020. This passage introduces Guthlac's reply to the servant's question and gives the reply itself. The poet has omitted a short reply and a second question, given by Felix, and has expanded the next five lines of the text. The master's reply, like the disciple's question, is faithful in substance to the original but has been developed with epic breadth.

1020b-1036. These verses, which expand the next sentence of Felix may well be quoted, together with the Latin, as an instructive example of the poet's ordinary procedure.

Ðā wæs wōp ond hēaf,	
3eozum 3eocor sefa,	3eomrende hy3e,
sipþan hē 3ehȳrde,	þæt se hāl3a wæs
forðsipes fūs:	hē þæs fāerspelles
fore his mondryhtne	mōdsor3e wæ3
hef3e æt heortan;	hreþer innan swēarc,
hy3e hrēowceari3,	þæs þe [hē] his hlāford
3esēah ellorfūsne.	Hē þæs onbæru
habban ne meahte,	ac hē hāte lēt
torn polierende	tēaras 3eotan,
weallan wē3dropan.	Wyrd ne meahte
in fā3um len3	feor3 3ehealdan,
dēore frætwe,	þonne him 3edēmed wæs.
On3eat 3āsta hāl3	3eomormōdes
drūsendne hy3e;	on3an þā du3uþa hlēo
3lædmōd 3ode lēof	3eoz3ran rētan,
wine lēofestan	wordum nē3an.

"His auditis prædictus Frater, flens et gemens, crebris lacrymarum rivulis mœstas genas rigavit: quem vir Dei consolans ait."

1037-1066 give Guthlac's consoling reply, which contains some of the noblest and tenderest poetry in Old English. They are based on five lines of quite tasteless Latin.

1067-1114 narrate subsequent events up to the seventh day thereafter. They are founded on the next eight lines in Felix.

1114b-1169 tell of the servant's visit to Guthlac on the seventh day, his request that he speak, and the saint's injunction to deliver a message to his sister. The passage is an expansion, again, of the next sixteen lines of Felix. The poet has omitted the name of the saint's sister, Pega, but has otherwise preserved everything in his source up to this point of the speech. The end of it, however, which concerns Guthlac's shroud, is omitted.

1170-1196. The servant questions Guthlac about his mysterious visitors. This is a generous expansion of the eight lines of Felix next following.

1197-1243 give the saint's account of his angelic visitants, which is expanded from the succeeding passage in the *Vita*, about thirteen lines. The statement, found in the Latin, that Beccel may not reveal, except to Pega and Ecgberht, the fact of the angels' visit, is left out.

1243b-1252. How the saint passed his last day, which is from the next four lines of Felix.

1252b-1269 form a poetic description of the oncoming night and of the miraculous light that encompassed the saint's dwelling. This is based on the next five or six lines of Felix.

1269b-1273 should be quoted with the Latin original, which follows straight on after the passage just mentioned. A comparison will show how well the poet understood when to speak at length and when to be terse.

	Tid is þæt þū fēre
ond þā ærendu	eal biþence,
ofestum lāde,	swa ic þē ær bibēad,
lāc tō lēofre!	nū of lice is
goddreāma ȝeorn	ȝæst swiðe fūs.

"Fili mi, præpara te, iter tuum perge; jam me nunc tempus cogit ab his membris dissolvi, et decursis hujus vitæ terminis ad infinita gaudia spiritus transtolli malit."

1274-1278, which briefly report the saint's death, illustrate the same point as the last passage. Five lines in Felix are devoted to the death.

1279-1300 recount the wonders that the servant saw and heard after his master died. The passage is gloriously developed from eight somewhat matter-of-fact lines in Felix.

1300b-1353. This passage wonderfully elaborates upon six and a half lines of Felix, which state baldly that Beccelinus was afraid, went by boat to Pega, and "fraterna sibi mandata omnia ex ordine narravit."

Here our English text unfortunately breaks off, leaving us in doubt as to the poet's identity, but quite ready to accept Wülker's conjecture that the ending may have contained Cynewulf's signature. Certainly, as far as the treatment of the source is concerned, the poem is extraordinarily like the work of Cynewulf. Anyone who will place the foregoing analysis side by side with Glöde's treatment of the source of the *Elene*,<sup>8</sup> or with Professor Cook's of the *Christ*,<sup>9</sup> will see that the method of poetic adaptation in the three works is essentially the same. No writer without the constructive imagination that Cynewulf undoubtedly possessed could have taken a chapter of turgid rhetoric like this one by Felix, and have made of it a great poem. That *Guthlac's Death* is a great poem I have no hesitancy in asserting. It is admirable for its clarity, for its just proportion, and for its sympathetic interpretation of nature and humanity. In all these essentials it is superior to *Guthlac the Hermit* as well as to most Old English poetry. I should be glad if my pedestrian comparison of it with its source made some of its virtues apparent. I think I have shown, at least, that its effects are due not at all to chance, but to manipulation by a poet with a genuine gift for construction. That he was Cynewulf I cannot prove, but that he was Cynewulf's peer seems to me very evident.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

*Princeton University.*

<sup>8</sup> *Anglia*, ix, 271-318.

<sup>9</sup> Summed up in the introduction and notes of *The Christ of Cynewulf*, 1900.

## TOM BROWN AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SATIRISTS

Very briefly, in his general history of English literature, Professor Saintsbury called attention to the indebtedness of Joseph Addison to his now almost forgotten predecessor, Tom Brown. The critic believed that "the great essayist who immediately followed him [Brown] owed more to him than might be imagined."<sup>1</sup> One side of this indebtedness, the relation of Addison's Oriental tales to the Indian traveler of Brown's *Amusements, Serious and Comical*, has since been given entirely satisfactory treatment.<sup>2</sup> But still the full story has not been told. Not only Addison, in more ways than this one, but other prose essayists of his time, derived much from their versatile, but licentious, forerunner that they never acknowledged.

Such influences are hard to trace or estimate. In the communistic literary life of the London journalists and catch-penny pamphleteers, proprietary rights in either thought or phrase were not recognized, and borrowing was universal. Tom Brown, in parts of his *Amusements, Serious and Comical*, is no more than the translator of Dufresny; yet he nowhere mentions his source. So Addison alluded only once, and then disparagingly, to the man from whom he drew so directly, calling him "T—m Br—wn of facetious memory," whose habit it was to gut a name of its vowels that he might "fall most unmercifully upon all the consonants." Swift was a little more frank. His Simon Wagstaffe admits having "read Mr. Thomas Brown's works entire," and having had "the honor to be his intimate friend, who was universally allowed to be the greatest genius of his age."<sup>3</sup> But elsewhere even Swift reflected on Brown's worth. He attributed much of the general incorrectness in every-day speech to the "monstrous productions, which, under the name of Trips, Spies, Amusements, and other conceited appellations, have overrun us for some years past."<sup>4</sup> Does he here refer to Brown, who, on his death-bed, pro-

<sup>1</sup> *Short History of English Literature*, pp. 526-527.

<sup>2</sup> M. P. Conant, *The Oriental Tale in England*, pp. 169-173.

<sup>3</sup> *Polite Conversation*, "Introduction."

<sup>4</sup> *Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*, ed. 1712, p. 13.

tested against being held responsible for many of the "lampoons, trips, London spies" that had appeared over his name? Where borrowers speak thus vaguely and misleadingly, the quest of literary relationship grows difficult indeed.

In several of the *Spectator Papers* the views of supposed Oriental travelers in London are expressed.<sup>5</sup> The idea, of course, was derived from Brown. But Steele and Addison owed much more than this to their predecessor. As early as 1705, four years before the appearance of the *Tatler*, Brown published his *Comical View of the Transactions That Will Happen in the Cities of London and Westminster*. It was a weekly publication containing predictions for the week that are full of thumbnail sketches of contemporary London life. Lawyers with their green bags, coughing in church, dinners at the Spread Eagle and meetings at the coffee-houses, public hangings at Tyburn and misbehavior in Covent Garden, all have their place in the quack astrologer's jottings. Some of the sketches are more complete. One might quote, for example: "Great Preparations at the Bear-garden all the Morning, for the noble Tryal of Skill that is to be play'd in the Afternoon. Seats fill'd and crowded by Two: Drums beat, Dogs yelp, Butchers and Foot-soldiers clatter their Sticks: At last the two Heroes, in their fine borrow'd Holland Shirts, mount the Stage about Three; Cut large Collops out of one another, to divert the Mob, and make Work for the Surgeons: Smoaking, Swearing, Drinking, Thrusting, Justling, Elbowing, Sweating, Kicking, Cuffing, Stinking, all the while the Company stays." Equally realistic is the item: "Doleful Procession up Holborn-hill about Eleven . . . Arrive at the fatal Place at Twelve. Burnt Brandy, Women, and Sabbath-breaking repented of. Some few Penitential Drops fall under the Gallows. Sheriff's Men, Parson, Pickpockets, Criminals, all very busie. The last concluding peremptory Psalm struck up. Show over by One." Surely, Steele was not the first to realize the possibilities for journalism of the daily affairs of London; "quidquid agunt homines"—this might have been Brown's motto.

Before reproducing Brown's pictures, Addison and Steele subjected them to a thorough cleaning. Sir Roger's meeting with the merry-makers on the Thames preserves all that is decent from

<sup>5</sup> Nos. 50, 557, 545, 343, 511. See above, M. P. Conant.

the sketch of the watermen's billingsgate in Brown's *A Walk round London and Westminster*. Addison's interest is in his knight's good-heartedness; Brown's is in the ribaldry of the boatmen. Nevertheless, Steele's fine paper, *A Ramble from Richmond to London*, brings strongly to the mind the sketchy manner of Brown.

At times, also, one finds Brown using the method of presentation that Addison often adopted. In many papers of the *Spectator* the essayist begins with a breezy sketch and ends with a half-serious proposal for reform. So Brown in *A Pleasant Epistle* first describes the subjects dear to the hearts of city poets and then suggests his remedy.<sup>6</sup>

Swift owed at least as much to the work of Brown. He began to torment the astrologer, Partridge, in his burlesque predictions for the year, 1708, and the joke was soon taken up by the wits of the town. Already, however, Brown had been teasing the poor victim. One couplet reads:

A Change so monstrous, I cou'd ne'er ha' thought  
Tho' Partridge all his Stars to vouch it brought.

In the same edition, that of 1707, these lines are found:

Asaph takes the wisest Course  
To prop three sinking Nations:  
For Partridge only bribes the Stars.  
But he the Revelations.<sup>7</sup>

*A Comical View* deals in more extended satire. It was published in 1705, one year after Brown's death. But it professes to be the weekly predictions of an astrological practitioner, Sylvester Partridge, and, since its dates hold good for the year 1700, it may have appeared then each Wednesday for a few successive weeks. At the end of each number Partridge prints an advertisement extolling his remedies and offering advice to the women. Swift had simply to carry on the joke.

Brown also used the fable as the medium of expression for political and religious satire, as Swift did in the *Tale of a Tub* and as Arbuthnot did in the *History of John Bull*. Mr. Alsop's *State of Conformity* tells of the owner of a large estate who was obliged to go on a long journey. Before departing, he urged his

<sup>6</sup> I, pp. 131-135, ed. 1715.

<sup>7</sup> I, pp. 90, 101, ed. 1707. Partridge is again remembered in Haines' second letter, II, p. 274, ed. 1715.



tenants to live in harmony and keep up the property. Soon, however, troublesome neighbors from the other side of the Tweed began to disturb the tenants and pilfer from the estate. All was in confusion, and the steward whom the intruders appointed proved more tyrannous than the former lord. Finally, he was driven out, and Harry and Jack were left in control. Then they, too, differed. Jack first wished to tear down all the fences, that everything might be in common, alleging that enclosures were contrary to the landlord's will. Harry, on the contrary, wished to preserve the estate as it had always been. Finally, Jack committed such serious trespass on the property of Harry that he was brought to court and convicted by the judge. "I need not make the application," Brown concludes, "the Pope, the Devil, and the Fanatick will appear thro' the Disguise of the Fable."

This fable, which of course has reference primarily to the dissenting church after King Charles the Second's Declaration of Indulgence, resembles in all respects the story of the will in *A Tale of a Tub* and that of the lawsuit in *Law is a Bottomless Pit*. A more direct source has been found for Swift's allegory,<sup>8</sup> and Brown did no more than contribute to the development of a form of satire used by Swift and Arbuthnot. But in addition to this fable and the joke on Partridge, Brown seems to have suggested other things to Swift. The satire at the expense of the scientists and philosophers in the third book of *Gulliver's Travels* may have been suggested by Brown. He mentions in one satire, among the relics of interest to Papists, "the Quadrant that a Philistine Taylor took the height of Goliah by, when he made his last Suit of Cloaths."<sup>9</sup> And among the "improvers of nature" in his philosopher's country, Brown professed to find "an old Bard cutting Asp-leaves into Tongues, which were to be fastened in the Mouths of Flowers, Fruits, Herbs and Seeds, with design to make the whole Creation Vocal." Another philosopher was engaged in "putting a Period to the Abstruse Debates between the Engineers and Mouse-trap makers."<sup>10</sup> The scientists whom Gulliver found were wasting their time in speculations very similar to these. Evidently, Swift had read the works of Brown entire, as he confessed.

<sup>8</sup> Archbishop Sharp's sermon. See Collins, *Life of Swift*, p. 47.

<sup>9</sup> *Reason of Mr. Bays changing his Religion*. Preface.

<sup>10</sup> *Amusements, Serious and Comical*. The Philosophical, or Virtuosi Country.

Such correspondences are to be expected between satirical and critical writers of the same age who keep close to the affairs of the day. In *The Mourning Poet* Brown condemned England's way of handling poor debtors; Goldsmith, in a less outspoken way, did the same in the *Vicar of Wakefield*. Brown and Addison held much the same opinion of the Italian opera. In mental power and in temperament alike, Brown was a man whose influence would be felt by his contemporaries in the world of letters. He is forgotten to-day only because his immediate successors, with their finer art and their higher literary standards, improved on all that he accomplished.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

*The State University of Iowa.*

#### NOTES ON *EPISTOLA ALEXANDRI AD ARISTOTELEM*

Professor Klaeber, in *Mod. Lang. Notes* XVIII, 246, suggests two emendations of the Old English version of the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem* as edited by Baskervill (*Anglia* IV, 139-167). As neither the ms. (Cott. Vit. A, xv) nor Cockayne's edition of the text could be consulted by Professor Klaeber at the time he wrote his article, his suggestions, as he himself admits, "have merely the value of guesses." Examination of the ms. itself prompts the following less conjectural corrections:<sup>1</sup>

(1) 584. Baskervill: *ða cwæð ic eft (Fol. 114b) [to] him and him spæc; liðum wordum co[stnode]. [S]ecgað, la, mec etc.*

Klaeber: A simpler and more satisfactory emendation than that offered in the printed text would be: *ða cwæð ic eft & him spæc liðum wordum to: Secgað, la, mec etc.*

The ms., however, demands the reading: *ða cwæð ic eft [to] him & him spræc liðum wordum to. [S]ecgað, la, mec etc.* The *r* of *spræc* is very faint but quite certain.

(2) 760. Baskervill: *ond eac (Fol. 128b) [pæt]te ecelice min gemynd stonde. [Ic] leonige oðrum eorðcyningum to bysne.*

Klaeber, rightly rejecting Toller's explanation of *leonige* as a form of *linian*, *leonian*, 'to leave,' proposes the following conjectural reading: . . . *ond eac pætte ecelice min*

<sup>1</sup> Bracketed letters in my emendations, are conjecturally supplied. Italicized letters are fragmentary but recognizable. Reference is by line to Baskervill's text.

gemynd stonde untweonde ge oðrum eorðcyningum to bysne . . . ; in support of which he adds, "In l. 7 there occurs (*betweoh*) *tweondan* (*frecnisse*).<sup>2</sup> The MS., however, clearly reads . . . *leonige* and . . . *ce ecelice*; so that the passage should read (and very naturally so): Ond eac (*Fol.* 131b) [swel]ce ecelice min gemynd stonde [& h]leonige oðrum eorðcyningum to bysne.

In addition to these two emendations the following should be made:

(3) 55. Baskervill: Singeall ne magon elcor beon buton minre gemynde swa geendebyrdd.

The reading should be: [þa] ðing eall [so Braun, *Lautlehre der angelsächsischen Version der Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*; cf. also l. 29] ne magon elcor beon buton mi[cel]re gemynde swa geendebyrdd.

(4) 98. Baskervill: f[a]g[e] and fægere

MS.: [h]wite & fægere

(5) 114. Baskervill: wildeora, þy[n]e on ða becwomon

MS.: wildeora þyl[c] we on ða becwomon

(6) 251. Baskervill: hie in þære ea aweollon swa æmettan ðam cras [!]

Read: . . . swa æmettan ða nicras (= nicoras)

(7) 290. Baskervill: ic þæt cyðe

MS.: ic þ̅ dyde

(8) 321. Baskervill: on ðæm (*Fol.* 122a) b[æ]c geeodon

Braun suggests *hrycge* or *bæcge*.

MS.: on ðæm h[r]iege eodon.

(9) 341. Baskervill: eac tigris us on þære nihte [and b]ar abisgodon.

Read: on þære nihte [þ]ar abisgodon. *þar* occurs elsewhere in this text. The Latin version has no mention of bears.

(10) 369. Baskervill: etan and wundedon

Braun: *etan* steht wahrscheinlich für *ætan*.

MS.: itan; before which space for one or two letters.

Read: [b]itan, or [ab]itan.

(11) 601. Baskervill: mine geferan bædon þæt hie swelc[e cune] þo bescerede ne wæron. What Baskervill takes for *cun* is merely the *umo* of *wynsumo* showing through the transparent margin.

MS.: swelcra me[r]þo bescerede ne wæron.

## REVIEWS

*The Life and Letters of Edward Young*, by Henry C. Shelley.  
Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1914. vii + 289 pp.

This is not only a very interesting, readable book,—it is also a valuable contribution to the history of English literature in the first half of the eighteenth century. Its special importance to the student lies perhaps in the fact that it introduces to him a very different Edward Young from that of tradition. Genial, witty, full of humor, frequently light-hearted as well as serious when occasion demanded: thus the author of the gloomy *Night Thoughts* of eighteenth century fame appeals to the reader in Mr. Shelley's pages. And this attractive if unexpected picture has been produced mainly by the skilful utilization of Young's own letters. He is made for the most part to tell his own life history. His work as poet, dramatist, and critic is described carefully and entertainingly. No previous writer has told so much in details about Young's poetical and dramatic career,—has evaluated his compositions so justly and thereby assigned to him definitely a far higher place as a poet (especially satirical poet) and a dramatist, that is, writer of tragedy, than he has hitherto occupied in English criticism. Moreover, and particularly, Young the man stands fully drawn before us in all his strength and weakness, his gloom and glory.<sup>1</sup> But Shelley has not, as did the poet's earlier biographers generally, over-emphasized his deficiencies and slighted his virtues. Sometimes, indeed, he might be charged with over-enthusiasm as defender of Young against many charges—perhaps mostly unjust and unfounded ones—that had their origin in the fertile imagination of his first biographer, Rev. Sir Herbert Croft. One feels, however, that Shelley understands the peculiar character of Young,—a compliment which can not with justice be paid any previous

<sup>1</sup> The nine chapters of the book have titles that indicate the scope of treatment: I. Parentage and Education, 1683-1712. II. Courtier and Poet, 1713-1719. III. Dramatist, 1719-1726. IV. Satirist, 1725-1728. V. Holy Orders, 1728-1741. VI. The *Night Thoughts*, 1742-1745. VII. Trelwyn and Elsewhere, 1746-1753. VIII. Moralist and Critic, 1754-1759. IX. Last Years, 1760-1765.

biographer,—and that he is especially concerned about the transmission of his impression to the reader.

In only one noteworthy respect does the picture fall far short of perfection. And this is in the omission of an account of the influence which Young's work as poet and critic exerted on the literature of foreign countries, particularly of Germany. The long chapter (Chap. VI, pp. 137-198) on *Night Thoughts* has not one word concerning the now well-known fact that this poem exercised an almost phenomenal influence upon the intellectual life of the German<sup>2</sup> people for a generation or more, beginning about the year 1745. Shelley apparently knows nothing, probably has never heard, about Kind's<sup>3</sup> valuable and thorough-going monograph on this subject. And though he does quote M. Joseph Texte's opinion on the relation of Narcissa's burial to that of Young's step-daughter, Elizabeth Temple, at Lyons,<sup>4</sup> he makes no effort to show the reader that the French people, too, in the years around 1760, were powerfully impressed by the melancholy and gloom that pervades *Night Thoughts*. In the chapter (VIII) on Young as 'Moralist and Critic' he gives a sufficient account of the *Conjectures on Original Composition*, but says nothing about the widespread circulation this letter-pamphlet enjoyed in Germany<sup>5</sup> and the determining influence it exerted on German dramatic criticism after 1760.

Young like his good friend Richardson was even more appreciated abroad than at home, as Kind has shown by numerous references. And one interesting testimonial to this popularity in Germany, which Kind has not recorded, is to be found in a letter from Wm. Mason to the poet Gray, written from Hanover, June 27, 1755, which records the following amusing bit of experience: "When I say that Mynheer—is the only erudite person whom I have yet seen, I must be understood to mean in this place, for

<sup>2</sup> And the Swiss also.

<sup>3</sup> *Edward Young in Germany*. By John Louis Kind. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1906. Columbia Univ. Germanic Studies, vol. II, No. III.

<sup>4</sup> Oct. 1736; cf. p. 157.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Kind, Chap. II, pp. 11-58. Saintsbury (*Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.* vol. X, Chap. VII) writes with equal unconsciousness of the existence of Kind's work, but does say (p. 156) that "Young enjoyed for a long time, great almost European popularity." The *Conjectures* was reprinted with an introduction a few years ago by Prof. Brandl in *Jahrbuch d. d. Shakesp. Gesellsch.*, vol. XXXIX (1903), pp. 1-42.

when I lately made a tour to Hamburgh, I met with another, tho' of a different sex, her name Madame Belcht. Her person I won't attempt to describe, but will endeavour to give you a Morceau of her conversation, for I was honoured with it. She asked me who was the famous poet that writ the *Nitt Toats*. I replied Doctor Yonge. She beg'd leave to drink his health, in a glass of sweet wine, adding that he was her favourite English author. We toasted the Doctor. Upon which, having a mind to give my Parnassian toast, I asked Madame Belcht if she had ever read *La petite Elegie dans La Ciemetere Rustique*. C'est beaucoup jolie, je vous assure! (for I had said fort jolie very often before.) Oui Monsieur, replied Madame Belch[t], ja lu et elle est bien jolie et melancholique, mais elle ne touche point la cœur comme mes cheres *Nitt Toats*."<sup>6</sup>

Now, one is not inclined to carp unnecessarily at the defects of a really good and valuable book, but it does seem a pity that the completeness of this work of Shelley's should have to suffer through what seems on the face of it to be inexcusable carelessness.

Among the interesting disputable points of Young's life which are illuminated by Shelley's discussions is the date of his birth. This has been established with measurable certainty as 1683, in spite of Joseph Warton's inscription, *In hoc cubiculo natus erat eximius ille Poeta Edvardus Young*, 1681, left in the room of Upham rectory in which the poet was born. For Dr. Warton "did not become rector of Upham until 1790,"<sup>7</sup> and "doubtless took his chronology from Sir Herbert Croft's biography." The parish register of Upham records the fact "that Edward Young was baptized on the 3rd of July, 1683," and "that the poet was born within a short period of his baptism is a safe inference from the fact that the summer of 1683 accords with the statements as to his age made when he was admitted to both Winchester and New College."<sup>8</sup>

Shelley discusses at considerable length the question as to the part which Young's bereavement played in the dark and gloomy spirit of *Night Thoughts*. Do the poet's son, his step-daughter, and her husband figure in the poem as Lorenzo, Philander, and Narcissa, respectively? Are the three deaths described in the first Night to be considered as having actually occurred in his own

<sup>6</sup> Tovey, *Letters of Thomas Gray*, vol. 1, p. 264.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Shelley, pp. 1-2.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Sir Leslie Stephen, *Dict. of National Biogr.* art. Edw. Young.



family circle? "Those three deaths," says Shelley,<sup>9</sup> "are the most puzzling problem of Young's biography, owing to the fact that in his poem he locates them so near to each other. After asking Death why he should exhaust his 'partial quiver' on a target so mean as himself, he continues—

'Insatiate archer! could not one suffice?  
Thy shaft flew thrice; and thrice my peace was slain;  
And thrice ere thrice yon moon had filled her horn.'

Now, if those lines are to be interpreted literally there is no escaping the conclusion that the poet had suffered three bereavements within three months. But unfortunately no known facts of his biography correspond with such a deduction.

It is usually supposed that the three deaths Young had in his mind were those of his step-daughter Elizabeth, her husband, and his own wife; but the first of these occurred in the October of 1736, the second in the August of 1740, and the third in the January of 1741. Thus the two bereavements which were nearest in point of time were separated by five months, while the third took place more than four years earlier."

Again he says<sup>10</sup> on this point: "Two of the three most famous characters of the *Night Thoughts*, Lorenzo and Philander, make their appearance in *The Complaint*, a fact which ought to have prevented the formulating of that insane theory which identified the first-named with the poet's own son. It has been seen that Frederick Young was born in the June of 1732, consequently by the date of the publication of *The Complaint* he had just completed his first decade, a somewhat early age for him to have served as the model of so accomplished a profligate as Lorenzo! . . . The most probable theory in the case of the worldly Lorenzo is that Young had the Duke of Wharton chiefly in mind; but the more rational position to assume is that his Lorenzo and Philander were composite portraits embodying traits observed in many men. To assert that the unworldly Philander was drawn solely from Henry Temple is to create new difficulties without solving the old, for whereas in the poem Philander dies before Narcissa, in actuality the reverse was the case."

Some critics have supposed that Narcissa was intended to repre-

<sup>9</sup> P. 146 f.

<sup>10</sup> P. 149.

sent Elizabeth Temple; but whomsoever she represented, it is a fact, that "the chief interest of the third of the *Night Thoughts* consists in its references" to her sad fate. "Her character is sketched in lines which are perhaps the most felicitous of the entire poem.

' Sweet harmonist! and beautiful as sweet!  
And young as beautiful! and soft as young!  
And gay as soft! and innocent as gay!  
And happy (if aught happy here) as good!  
For fortune fond had built her nest on high,  
Like birds quite exquisite of note and plume,  
Transfixt by fate (who loves a lofty mark)  
How from the summit of the grove she fell,  
And left it unharmonious! All its charms  
Extinguisht in the wonders of her song!  
Her song still vibrates in my ravisht ear,  
Still melting there, and with voluptuous pain  
(O to forget her!) thrilling thro' my heart! ' " <sup>11</sup>

If the poem is to be accepted as literally true, the following facts emerge: Narcissa died after Philander; <sup>12</sup> she was snatch'd in her 'bridal hour'; as soon as the 'lustre languisht in her eye' and 'pale omen' sat upon her cheek, the poet, with 'parental haste,' bore her to a warmer clime; and when death seized her in a foreign land, she, owing to her Protestant faith, was denied Christian burial. <sup>13</sup>

On the theory that Narcissa was Elizabeth Temple, and that the incident described above took place in France, this was, as Joseph Texte has confessed, a serious enough matter to 'cover the French nation with confusion.' He adds: 'The gruesome story of the father burying his daughter in secret went the round of Europe; and a lugubrious engraving representing Young interring Narcissa by the light of a lantern was introduced as a frontispiece to the second volume of Letourneur's translation of the *Night Thoughts*. Such intolerance on the part of the French seemed monstrous. Young, the victim of fate, appeared also to be the victim of fanaticism, and for many a long year English visitors made pilgrimages to the melancholy grotto where this drama had been enacted. Unfortunately for the poet's sincerity, the story is of his own in-

<sup>11</sup> Ll. 81-93.

<sup>12</sup> But in reality both Elizabeth Temple and Lady Young died several years before Henry Temple.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. *Night* 3, ll. 170-178.

vention. The death of Young's step-daughter did actually occur in France, but at Lyons, as a learned inhabitant of that town has shown, and not Montpellier; she was buried at the former place, not in a nameless grave, but in the enclosure formerly reserved for Protestants, and not by stealth, but with all befitting ceremony. At most it appears that the cost of the interment was excessive, and it was this trifling grievance that was dramatically treated by Young.'"<sup>14</sup>

The *Night Thoughts* itself offers unfortunately no definite solution for the problem of its own mystery. Young, almost painfully reticent about his domestic affairs in his correspondence, is from the nature of the case, that is, the demands of art, more so in his poetry. Judging from the spirit and character of the poem and the time that he began to write it, critics, including Shelley, have asserted that the death of Lady Young was the inspiration which set him to planning and writing the first *Night*. But we do not know exactly when he began his poem. In all his letters of the years 1741 and 1742 there is just one rather playful reference to *Night Thoughts* and not a single one to the death of Lady Young. Writing to the Duchess of Portland, May 3, 1742, he says: "Such is my opinion of your Grace's goodness, that I can choose no subject more agreeable to you than to speak of your friends. Last week a neighbour of poor Dr. Clarke's now in Huntingdonshire called on me; he told me our friend was still living, and that his physician said he might possibly live four or five years longer. . . . Dr. Clarke's behaviour brings to my memory some lines which I have formerly read, whether it be in Fletcher perhaps your Grace can tell. After the author has represented a good man, whose name is Philander, on his deathbed behaving to the surprise of all about him, he adds:

'As some tall tower, or lofty mountain's brow  
Detains the sun, illustrious from its height,  
When rising vapours, and descending shades,  
In damps and darkness drown the spacious vale,  
Philander thus augustly reared his head  
Undamped by doubt, undarkened by despair;  
At that black hour, which general horror sheds

---

<sup>14</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Cosmopolitan Spirit in Literature, 305-6, quoted by Shelley, p. 157 f. Cf. original French ed. (*Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les origines du Cosmopolitisme Littéraire*, Paris, 1895), p. 370 f.

On the low level of inglorious minds,  
 Sweet *peace*, and heavenly *hope*, and humble *joy*,  
 Divinely beamed on his exalted soul,  
 With incommunicable lustre bright.'<sup>15</sup>

Now, these are the concluding lines of the second *Night*, and their appearance in this letter would seem to show that the first part of the poem was completed by May, 1742.<sup>16</sup> And the *Complaint* or *Night Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality* was actually published by Dodsley in June, 1742. It is therefore not improbable that Young began the composition of his poem soon after the death of his wife (January 1741). But there is no definite evidence on this point, any more than there is for the assertion that Lady Young (or Elizabeth Temple) was the original of Narcissa. In many respects, indeed, it appears doubtful whether the poet had any particular person, man or woman, in mind while he was writing *Night Thoughts*. He so rarely made his own private affairs the theme of his poems or letters,—he was so impersonal in his writings. Even the preface of the fourth *Night* is not convincing in this connection. "The first of the *Night Thoughts*," says Shelley "was issued to the world without explanation of the melancholy experiences which had inspired its lines, but to the fourth poem the author contributed a preface in which he assured his readers that the occasion of his work was 'real not fictitious.'<sup>17</sup> The poem was begun, he added, "purely as a refuge under uneasiness, when more proper studies wanted sufficient relish to detain the writer's attention to them."

Nothing of Young's so well illustrates his ability to keep his personal sorrows to himself, as well as to appear cheerful and care-free towards his friends, as his letters to the Duchess of Portland. And one of these, written in February, 1741, when his grief over the death of his wife would naturally be most intense, in which however there is not a trace of gloom or melancholy, may be quoted here:

"Money is the devil, and ever doing mischief, but it never did me greater than now, in denying me the honor and pleasure of wait-

<sup>15</sup> See *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire* (*Historical Manuscripts Commission*), vol. I, London, 1904, p. 254, where all Young's letters to the Duchess of Portland were first printed.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Shelley, p. 146.

<sup>17</sup> P. 146.

ing on Your Grace before I leave town.<sup>18</sup> But you, Madam, who can confer undeserved favours with so great facility, will, I hope, find no great difficulty in excusing involuntary faults. I had the delight and reputation yesterday morning of waiting on Mrs. Pendarves,<sup>19</sup> but what followed stands candidate for a place among your Grace's mysteries." "*Postscript*—But your Grace is a naturalist, I will therefore talk with you in your own way. What so flowry and fragrant as the woodbine! What so luxuriant and fruitful as the vine! How they ravish our senses! How they gladden the heart of man! How divinely they inspire! Such, Madam, is your sex; but then, as you are made exquisite like these, so like these, in compassion to poor mankind, you are made feeble too. You were both designed to give a tender twine around something stronger than yourselves. The vine and woodbine were not designed for celibacy, but to mingle their branches with the rough oak, or elm, obliging, and obliged, receiving succour while they confer the most perfect ornament and delight. Now, Madam, a lady of genius, that abounds in arts and accomplishments, she can agreeably employ every hour by herself; she can stand alone; she is free from that weakness which lays other ladies under the natural necessity of an embrace; and I wish that this is not somewhat the case of your friend.

"If your Grace does me the honour of a line, you will assist me in this nice speculation. I should be glad for the sake of mankind to find myself mistaken, about her, for really, Madam, if she is made *only* to be admired, I shall value her no more than an angel. And poor angels, your Grace knows, will meet with many powerful rivals in so wicked a world as this."<sup>20</sup>

There is not the slightest hint of Young's recent sad bereavement in this letter, nor is there any more in either of the two immediately preceding letters, both of which were apparently written in January,—that is to say, in the very month of Lady Young's death. In the first of these, which is largely concerned about Mrs. Pendarves, there is the same jovial spirit of bantering humor noticeable in the one quoted above: "It is my duty to write, though perhaps it would be my prudence to forbear, for what shall I write? Yet I will obey your Grace, and disobey you at the same time, for pray what difference is there between not writing and writing nothing? Since your Grace has laid me under an obligation and a difficulty at the same time by your kind command, I will take my revenge

<sup>18</sup> This letter was written in London.

<sup>19</sup> This is, of course, the later celebrated Mrs. Delaney, who was a frequent visitor in the Portland home and a good friend of Young's.

<sup>20</sup> *Bath MSS.* I, 259 f.

by being as severe on your Grace's letter as I possibly can. I am as ambitious to find faults in such a correspondent, as your friends, the natural philosophers, are to find spots in the sun: and I think I can do it effectually. You say, Madam, the more knowledge I have of Mrs. P——, the greater esteem I shall have for her. Madam, you are mistaken, my knowledge of her may increase, but I think my esteem for her cannot; at least I do not desire it should," etc.<sup>21</sup>

"But that the poet sorrowed sincerely and deeply over the loss of his wife is proved by more than his son's testimony that he was 'never cheerful' after her death. That bereavement, indeed, cast a sombre shadow over many years of his life; it was not only to make his muse still more melancholy, but to impart a sobriety to his most graceful compliments."<sup>22</sup>

There is one further point that would seem to have considerable weight in the solution of the mystery surrounding the characters of *Night Thoughts*, and Shelley has not touched upon it. Years before Young had even thought of the theme for his masterpiece he had used two or three names of the characters in *Night Thoughts* in a wholly general and impersonal connection. In his satire, *The Universal Passion*, published between 1725 and 1730, the names of Lorenzo and Philander figure to some extent, as the following selections show:

"On buying books Lorenzo long was bent,  
But found at length that it reduced his 'rent';  
His farms were flown; when, lo! a sale comes on,  
A choice collection! what is to be done?

When terms were drawn, and brought him by the clerk,  
Lorenzo sign'd the bargain—with his mark "<sup>23</sup>

"I grant at court, Philander, at his need,  
(Thanks to his lovely wife) finds friends indeed.  
Of every charm and virtue she's possest.  
Philander! thou art exquisitely blest,"<sup>24</sup> etc.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 258.

<sup>22</sup> Shelley, p. 137. Kind's remarks (p. 61) that "he did not begin to pour out his inconsolable grief until sometime after the taking off of his spouse whose death he really does not mourn until the *Ninth Night*, almost five years after her death," shows that he had not read the *Ninth Night*; for there is surely nothing about Lady Young's death in this poem.

<sup>23</sup> *Satire II, Aldine Edition*, p. 71. <sup>24</sup> *Satire III, Ibid.*, p. 84.



Might not we therefore be justified in insisting that the characters of *Night Thoughts* are entirely fictitious and not to be definitely connected with any member of Young's family, nor with any of his friends?

There does not, moreover, seem to have been any real basis for the charges<sup>25</sup> of insincerity made against Young in connection with the death and burial of his step-daughter. Kind's assertion, "They [i. e. the Germans] were touched by his grief, so they overlooked the artificiality of the 'Complaint,' and did not realize the bombast and insincerity of the poet-preacher, who was quite gay and dissipated in youth and was weaned from the world only when age overtook him,"<sup>26</sup> appears to be entirely unjust in the light of Shelley's presentation and interpretation of the poet's character. For, while it cannot be denied that Young devoted too large a portion of his time in the first half of his life to the pursuit of fame and made himself somewhat ridiculous by his numerous (and mainly worthless) dedicatory odes to various noblemen (some of them of doubtful characters) in the hope of obtaining influential patronage,<sup>27</sup> there is no reliable evidence anywhere that he was ever dissipated. And after he took orders, sometime between 1725 and 1728, when he was in the middle years of his life, there is absolutely no reason for believing that he did not perform his duties, first as Chaplain to the King, and from 1730 until his death, as rector of Welwyn, with dignity and decorum, if not with distinction and glory.<sup>28</sup>

As has already been suggested, it is by liberal and eminently suitable selections from the more than one hundred of Young's

<sup>25</sup> See Joseph Texte, *op. cit.*; Shelley, p. 158.

<sup>26</sup> Kind, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

<sup>27</sup> Saintsbury (*op. cit.*), too, has given a wholly one-sided picture of Young and his work, because he apparently followed slavishly earlier biographers and had not read the poet's letters, tho' they had been accessible for several years. "Throughout each of these long periods [of his life] he appears (except at the moment of his election to All Souls) as a disappointed man, baffled as to regular promotion at school; wandering from college to college; not, indeed, ever in apparent danger of the jail, but incessantly and fruitlessly courting the patron," p. 157. In his recently published *Peace of the Augustans* (London, Bell and Sons, 1916) Saintsbury does refer in passing to Young's Letters to the Duchess of Portland. See p. 61, footnote. On Young's efforts to obtain patronage in the latter part of his life, see Shelley, pp. 150-151; also p. 199 f.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Shelley, Chap. v.

letters to the Duchess of Portland, that Shelley makes the poet seem a wholly different man, especially in the last twenty-five years of his life, from the conception of him given by all his previous biographers.<sup>29</sup> The author has also supplemented the story of this period by using letters to Richardson and to several other friends. For the first two-thirds of his life comparatively few of Young's really delightful letters have been preserved, but most of these have been quoted by Shelley.

Never before have the intimacy and importance of Young's relations with the novelist Richardson been so clearly set forth as they are in this book. And it is again through references in his letters to the Duchess of Portland as well as to Richardson, that we are led to see how much encouragement the novelist received from the poet while he was busy with the composition of his works, especially of *Clarissa Harlowe*. Richardson's biographers have done but scanty justice to Young as an inspiring critic of the famous novelist. Though Austin Dobson does say<sup>30</sup> that Young "was probably one of his best critics;" and Miss Thomson tells us that the correspondence between Young and Richardson "dates back to 1740," and that Richardson was the publisher of the *Night Thoughts*.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, she finds the correspondence of these two men not very interesting, and on Young's side, at least . . . tinged with much melancholy." Shelley's extracts, and particularly the references in the Portland letters, seem to show clearly that Young was not only one of Richardson's most highly esteemed critics, but that he was perhaps the one friend besides Aaron Hill to whom the novelist confided most freely his literary plans.<sup>32</sup> There are definite references to his telling Young about the plan of *Clarissa* and sending him parts of the story in manuscript, several years before the book

<sup>29</sup> I have not had access to *Le Poète Edward Young*, by W. Thomas, Paris, 1901; but he could have known nothing of the letters of the Duchess of Portland.

<sup>30</sup> *Samuel Richardson, E. M. of L. Series*, p. 75.

<sup>31</sup> Clara Linklater Thomson, *Samuel Richardson, a Biographical and Critical Study*, London, 1900, p. 121-2.

<sup>32</sup> In a letter to Young, Nov. 1747 (see Dobson, *op. cit.*, p. 75) Richardson writes: "What contentions, what disputes have I involved myself in with my poor *Clarissa* through my own diffidence, and want of will! I wish I had never consulted anybody but Dr. Young, who so kindly vouchsafed me his ear and sometimes his opinion."

was published,—possibly soon after he began to write. Dobson tells us that Young sent Hill “two specimen chapters” of the novel in 1744, and that “By July 1744 Richardson has sent him the entire design or compendium of the story, with which Hill is in raptures.”<sup>33</sup> Miss Thomson says<sup>34</sup> *Clarissa* “was probably begun not long after the publication of the *Tour through Great Britain* [1742], since Hill, in an unpublished letter of February, 1745, alludes to the ‘charming Miss Harlowe,’ etc.” Now if Mr. Dobson and Miss Thomson had looked a little more carefully into the correspondence of Young and Richardson as printed by Mrs. Barbauld, they would have found references to *Clarissa* that are as early as 1744. Shelley reprints<sup>35</sup> one of these letters which bears the date July 9, 1744, and which contains the following interesting paragraph: “Be not concerned about Lovelace: ’tis the likeness, not the morality, of a character we call for. A sign-post angel can by no means come into competition with the devils of Michael Angelo.” In another but undated letter, belonging according to Shelley,<sup>36</sup> to the close of the year 1744 Young shows very accurate knowledge of and intimate concern in, the progress of his friend’s great work: “Does Lovelace do more than a proud, bold, graceless heart, long indulged in vice, would naturally do? No. Is it contrary to the common method of Providence, to let the best suffer the most? No. When the best do suffer, does it not most deeply affect the human heart? Yes. And is it not your business to affect the human heart as deeply as you can? Yes.

“Your critics on seeing the first two or three acts of *Venice Preserved*, the *Orphan*, and *Theodosius*, would have advised that the innocent and amiable Belvidera, Monmia, and Athenais, should be made happy; and thus would have ruined our three best plays.

“But you ask, how come they then to give this advice? From ignorance, or envy, or affectation of a delicate concern and high zeal for virtue; or from such a degree of infidelity as suffers not their thoughts to accompany *Clarissa* any further than her grave. Did they look farther, the pain they complain of would be removed; they would find her to be an object of envy as well as pity; and

<sup>33</sup> Dobson, *op. cit.*, 73-4.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, 41.

<sup>35</sup> P. 180. This notice without reference to the date of the letter is printed by Miss Thomson, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

<sup>36</sup> See p. 184.

the distressed would be more than balanced by the triumphant Clarissa: and thus would they be reconciled to a story, at which their short-sighted tenderness for virtue pretends to take offence.

"Believe me, Christians of taste will applaud your plan, and they who themselves would act Lovelace's part, will find the greatest fault in it."<sup>37</sup>

It is not until near the close of the year 1747 that we begin to find frequent and significant discussions of *Clarissa Harlowe* in Young's letters to the Duchess of Portland. That there are no earlier references<sup>38</sup> is doubtless to be accounted for by the fact that Young knew the novelist was not an agreeable subject of conversation (or correspondence) to the Duchess. But on Nov. 22, 1747, he had the courage to write: "A second work by the author of Pamela will be published in a fortnight, and I fancy your Grace will find amusement in it, if, I mean, your taste is for a melancholy tale. I have heard it formerly, and not without a tear; but, as I remember, your Grace laughs at fiction; if so, I must visit others to see them weep."<sup>39</sup> Then on Jan. 29, 1748, he says on the same subject: "I heartily hope my friend R—n was a false prophet; prophets of old had two provinces, one was to foretell, the other was to instruct. Though he may have failed in the first, yet he has not in the last. Has your Grace read his Clarissa? What a beautiful brat of the brain is there! I wish your Grace would stand godmother, and give it its name, *Clarissa the Divine*. That romance will probably do more good than a body of Divinity. If all printers could turn such authors, I would turn printer in order to be instrumental in promoting such benefit to mankind.

"And yet, Madam, this excellent offspring of the imagination

<sup>37</sup> This letter, so valuable and interesting in the genesis of the story and the character conception of Clarissa, is not referred to by either Dobson or Thomson.

<sup>38</sup> The first (apparent) reference in the Portland correspondence to Richardson's novels occurs in a letter from Feb. 1742(?), and seems to be about *Pamela*: "As I design myself the honour of waiting on your Grace very soon, I shall not by letter forestall what I have to say as to the authors you mention. Fiction may have a good tendency, and history may have a bad one, which I believe to be the case with regard to these two writers [Richardson and Fielding?], of whom I shall say no more at present." *Bath MSS.*, I, 270. Cf. Shelley, p. 141.

<sup>39</sup> *Bath MSS.*, I, 308.

was in danger of having been stifled in its birth; or, at least, of having been made a changeling. I think your Grace knows Mr. Littleton; he, Mr. Fielding, Cibber, etc., all of them pressed the author very importunately to make his story end happily; but does not your Grace think that it is infinitely better as it is?"<sup>40</sup>

Young's enthusiasm for *Sir Charles Grandison* was only a little less pronounced than that for *Clarissa*. But his admiration for the last of Richardson's novels was due perhaps in some measure to the fact that *Grandison* was mainly responsible for the Duchess of Portland's change of heart toward the famous novelist.

The binding, print, and paper of the book are very attractive. It is indeed in outward show what every worthy book should be: its appearance makes one want to read it. The pages are adorned with a few select illustrations, beginning with a frontispiece of the poet "From an engraving by J. Collyer," and concluding with the "Young Memorial Stone, Welwyn Rectory Grounds" (p. 280), all in good taste. The proof-reading was well done, so that typographical errors are few. I have noticed only *Budd* (for *Bubb*) Dodington, p. 62.

WM. H. HULME.

*Western Reserve University.*

---

*Gottfried Keller as a Democratic Idealist*, by EDWARD FRANKLIN HAUCH. New York, Columbia University Press, 1916, x and 96 pages.

Gottfried Keller has in the main been fortunate in his critics. Baechtold confined himself in his three volumes (1897) to collecting a great wealth of biographical material and letters. The *Life of Keller*, by Emil Ermatinger (1915), based upon Baechtold's collectanea, is not as yet accessible. The *Seven Lectures* of Albert Koester (Leipzig, 1900), one of the sanest books on Keller, aimed at no more than 'to unite old friends of the poet more closely, and to gain new ones.' Between these publications falls the more ambitious work of Baldensperger (Paris, 1899), which is greatly concerned with the question, how much of Keller's permanent worth

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 312; cf. Shelley, pp. 220-21. Littleton, Fielding, Cibber, etc., may be "Your Critics" of the letter from 1744, quoted above.

(*valeur*) will bear exportation beyond the confines of his native Switzerland. Baldensperger rightly perceives that authors who, like Keller, do not exalt individualism or the instinct of personal force, but rather sport with its deviations and unmask its vanities, do not, as a rule, burst upon other nations as a welcome revelation. He therefore expresses the hope that his exhaustive analyses of the works themselves may serve as a method of indirect approach.

Edward Franklin Hauch takes his stand at the opposite pole. Not the man and his work, but 'Gottfried Keller as a Democratic Idealist' is his theme. One of the most individual of modern poets is to be investigated by the principles of exact science, and technical nomenclature is employed. By means of this 'algebra of language,' Keller's pessimism, romanticism, realism and democracy are weighed in the balance. Hauch maintains that through 'some degree of uniformity of connotation, a great deal of cumbersome and confusing circumlocution can be avoided.' He hopes that by this means he may 'arrive at an intelligent estimate of the literary or philosophical significance' of his author.

One might have expected that a critic intent upon interpreting Keller, as political and philosophic thinker, to the American public would have given us a series of comparisons with characteristic figures in our own historical environment. Gottfried Keller, who stood at the modern parting of the ways in his native country, having lived under three successive cantonal constitutions, offers in many ways partial similarities to early Americans, particularly as seen through the eyes of our own Hawthorne, the one American author whose genius bears any relation to that of Keller. A single word, to the effect that Keller, like Alexander Hamilton, desired 'a historically federalistic, coercive but representative union, with devices to give weight to the influence of education and property, and with no initiative and referendum' would have inspired a home feeling for him; while an additional remark, that Keller occupied a position midway between Hamilton's distrust of the people and Jefferson's complete confidence in their integrity, self-control and good judgment,<sup>1</sup> would almost have served to domicile Keller amongst us as a political thinker. Conrad Ferdinand

<sup>1</sup>With Keller it was more faith than confidence. His confidence was more than once completely shattered, but his faith in the sound instincts of the folk-soul, and in the ultimate political outcome sustained and supported him in every trial.



Meyer marvelled most at Gottfried Keller's 'attitude as a protecting genius to his country, standing aloof from all men, full of inquietudes, indulging in sermonizings, replete with sage advice, practicing paternal chastisements.' Hawthorne has given us in the following an almost identical judgment of Washington:<sup>2</sup>

'The collection of Washington's recorded traits seems sufficiently abundant, and strictly harmonizes with itself, yet never brings us into intimate relation with the hero, nor makes us feel the warmth and the human throb of his heart. What can be the reason? Is it, that his great nature was adapted to stand in relation to his country, as man stands towards man, but could not individualize itself in brotherhood to an individual?'

All material of this kind is either not thought of at all, or is disdained by Hauch, who chooses instead to erect a series of sterile philosophical-political formulae, and to judge his author by them. His graceful translations from Keller's poems give the lie to this sterility and awaken the wish, that he could have adopted a concrete, that is to say a literary method of presenting his subject as a whole.

Hauch's treatment of Keller's novel *Das verlorene Lachen* supplies a capital example of this fundamental error in plan and method. He finds in the close of the story 'democracy of the most radical kind applied to the problems of the inner life; in the last analysis, each must be his own priest and his own judge.' It is safe to say that Keller had as little intention of producing such an impression, as had Goethe in his *Metamorphose der Pflanzen*, where

'Die heilige Liebe

Strebt zu der höchsten Frucht gleicher Gesinnungen auf,  
Gleicher Ansicht der Dinge, damit in harmonischem Anschau  
Sich verbinde das Paar, finde die höhere Welt.'

In Goethe's poem, as in Keller's story, the collectivism of the family is differentiated with the highest art from active but barren individualism, and is emphasized as the 'heiliges Rätsel,' the 'geheimes Gesetz' at the basis of orderly civic society. The scene of the poetic sermon is in the one case Goethe's botanic garden at his house on the 'Frauenplan,' and in the other a Swiss forest-nursery. The impassioned sermonizer pours out his philosophy in either case

<sup>2</sup> 'A Book of Autographs.' *Works*, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., n. d. Vol. iv, p. 153.

to his life's partner, as symbolizing the world outside of himself and his own relation to that—through her—newly discovered world. The characteristic difference remains, that in Goethe's poem—as always with him, save in the single exception of his relation to Frau von Stein—woman remains the docile and dependent half, while in Keller's stories one woman almost invariably appears—in *Martin Salander* it is a son—who has a greater hold on reality, and through whose surer wisdom, founded on intuition but aided by experience, the hero makes his peace with his destiny. Keller, like Goethe, arrived in his later productions at a highly individualized collectivism, and both poets, notwithstanding fundamental differences of attitude, reached their goal along the same path.

In literary matters also, Keller had his brief period of inconclusive generalization, as when he fancied that out of the Berlin farces with their couplets a new variety of Aristophanic national comedy might arise. But what distinguished him from doctrinaire literary historians like Hettner, who snatched at this Aristophanic idea, was that Hettner never overcame the tendency to baseless philosophical generalization, while in Keller it soon disappears, never to return. These his outgrown associates were the men of the 'uncompromisingly democratic attitude of mind in all things,' a characteristic which Hauch (p. 4) welcomes and exalts in Keller, but from which he energetically shook himself free, as for instance in his little known and seldom cited *Apotheker von Chamounix*. In this travesty of *Romancero*, Heine, after a wordy battle with Börne, is thrust into the great sea of ink, in which Gutzkow, Young Germany's monarch ('der grosse Tinterich') in the great democratic barathrum, is already swimming about.

In the famous toast, in the year 1873,<sup>3</sup> it was again Keller who 'compromised,' by saying that he could conceive of a time in the distant future, when autonomous Switzerland, should it ever forego its life principle of five hundred years' growth and be drawn into the vortex of out and out democracy, might be resuscitated and restored by a union with the land of 'Light and Power,' with modern Germany; and it was the 'uncompromising' German democrat, the then vastly overrated poet Gottfried Kinkel, who opposed him on that historic occasion, and undertook to be more

<sup>3</sup> *Nachgelassene Schriften und Dichtungen*, Berlin, 1893, pp. 358-361.

Swiss than Keller himself. Gottfried Keller's singular modesty in this and other controversies where it was a question of his country's future, the complete absence of self-seeking and doctrinaire contentiousness in even his most impassioned pleadings and warnings, recall to mind the superb characterization in his *Union of the Valiant Seven*, as that through which he himself would doubtless have preferred to be known and remembered:

'They are unblazed standing timber in the forest growth of the nation. They emerge for a moment into the sunlight of the fatherland's day, only to withdraw again into the shadow, where they rustle and murmur with the thousand other tree-trunks in their native forest glooms, where few claim acquaintance, but where all are familiarly and intimately known.'

HENRY WOOD.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*European Characters in French Drama of the Eighteenth Century.*

By HARRY KURZ, PH. D. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916.

The title of the book is too general. It would imply a study of all characters in eighteenth century French drama, the non-European characters being entirely negligible. Yet, as the author explains, "the object of this study is to trace the opinions about foreign nations held by the French during the eighteenth century, in so far as the numerous comic writers of the time reflected these views in their plays." A less ambiguous title, then, would have been: "Foreigners as seen by French theatre-goers of the eighteenth century," a title which would better indicate the wide scope of the subject. In separate chapters, Dr. Kurz investigates how the eighteenth century dramatists treat the Italians, the Spanish, the Germans, the English, and the people of the Minor Nations.

The plays which include Italian characters bring out the latter only in a superficial way. Their only conclusion betraying a real observation of Italian life seems to be that conventions are strict and Italian wives are of the utmost fidelity.

From the study of Spanish characters even less is to be gleaned. The writers, apparently realizing their meager knowledge of contemporary Spain, often bring in historic Spain, though the atmos-

phere even there (as, for instance, in Destouches: *L'Ambitieux et l'Indiscrète*) is far from being essentially Spanish. A special section is devoted to the Spain of Beaumarchais. Why Dr. Kurz should do this is not clear, especially when, as he himself admits, "Beaumarchais is essentially French in his pictures and utters truths that are no more Spanish than French or English."

The burden of the thesis lies in the chapter on the English. The writer shows how, in 1734, the publication of Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques* laid the foundation in France of a lasting admiration for the English, and this in spite of numerous political conflicts, for as Dr. Kurz well points out, no English army ever set foot in France during this period, and the people felt no real animosity toward the English. Practically all the evidence brought forward goes to show how this admiration grew.

One English lord (Boissy: *Le Comte de Neuilly*) is shown devoting his life to the family of an exiled friend; another (Falbaire: *Le Fabricant de Londres*), unlike his care-free French brother, is a stern thinker. Many are represented as philanthropic and optimistic; many take pride in letters. Young Englishmen ape French ways and almost invariably speak excellent Parisian French. Even English actresses are pictured as being models of virtue. Englishmen fight no duels; and if they are taciturn and commonly appear to be suffering from melancholia, that is because they are deep thinkers. This characterization of thoughtfulness is constantly recurring and Dr. Kurz would have done well here to have advanced the explanation offered by Voltaire<sup>1</sup> that men are forced to think when they have the responsibilities of democratic government on their shoulders.

English merchants are represented as brusque but honest and benevolent. In 1727, one Jacques Rosbif (Boissy) makes the significant statement: "Les vrais gentilhommes ce sont les honnêtes gens il n'y a que le vice de roturier." Occasionally we find a quack physician or a deceitful clergyman; but usually Englishmen are portrayed as most virtuous. Jailers are generous and even the servants are absolutely devoted and trustworthy. English women are less coquettish than French women; more faithful as wives. "In England," to judge by Gresset's *Sidnei*, "a girl's conception of love is more basic and sincere."

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres Philosophiques*, xx.

Dr. Kurz has certainly collected enough evidence to prove that French theatre-goers of the eighteenth century considered England a sort of Utopia; but he is apparently content with presenting the picture. Not once does he inquire how far all this is true. As a matter of fact eighteenth century England was far from being a privileged land of virtue, the nobility was brutal and debauched, the clergy ignorant, the courts corrupt. Witness the depraved condition of high society as pictured by Fielding and other novelists of the time.<sup>2</sup> Recall also what Voltaire had to say about the grossness of the English stage.<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Kurz's findings are significant, then, not so much in showing just what eighteenth century Frenchmen really knew about England, but rather how they were deceived about it. As Joseph Texte puts it: "Les hommes du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle ont admiré une Angleterre idéale, parce qu'ils ont voulu qu'elle fût conforme à leur rêve."<sup>4</sup> England was a land of liberty whence blew a "vent philosophique." Of course it is far from probable that the writers of these light plays wilfully deceived their audiences about England; most of them wrote with no other motive than to amuse. Dr. Kurz even expresses surprise (p. 301) that the comedies examined by him show so few traces of the "esprit philosophique," whereas the *opéras comiques* of the last part of the century were bristling with it and there were numerous "pièces à thèse" written to spread it.<sup>5</sup> Yet, in so far as these writers did present an ideal picture of England, whether intentionally or unintentionally, they contributed no small part to the development of the "mouvement philosophique," by making the people turn an attentive ear towards England; and consequently they participated in no uncertain way in the formation of that mighty public opinion which was to overturn France. In this way, then, Dr. Kurz's findings may be said to contribute a chapter, by no means unimportant, to the history of "La Philosophie et le Théâtre" in the eighteenth century.

There are one or two faulty details in the book which should not pass unnoticed. For instance, when Mr. Kurz mentions eighteenth century novels characterized by their strong love of nature (p. 121) it is astonishing that he should have omitted *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, though he included *Atala*, which appeared in

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Forsyth, *Novels and Novelists*.

<sup>3</sup> *Lettres Philosophiques*, XIX.

<sup>4</sup> *Le Cosmopolitisme Littéraire*, p. 114.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Voltaire, *Nanine*.

1801. Then his argument that Englishmen and Spaniards of that day spoke French without an accent, simply because he finds them using elegant French in these light comedies, seems rather naïve. The typographical errors are remarkably few: (119) Political Psycholoy (for *psychology*); (167) leur sciences (for *science*) les charge; (192) English pays (for *plays*); (303) forcement (for *forcément*).

As to content, Mr. Kurz has amassed an enormous amount of material, having read and analyzed more than 120 plays. It is to be regretted, however, that he did not make more capital out of it by going one step further and inquiring just why eighteenth century French comic writers displayed such great admiration for the English. It is also most unfortunate that the work is not more compact. A considerable part of the material, indeed, seems to have been included only to prove its own uselessness either as an interesting set of documents or as a help to the general thesis.

As to style, while it is true that in this respect the book is not unlike many other doctor's dissertations, still it is deeply to be deplored that good, solid work, worthy of a doctor of philosophy, should be marred by not being presented in uniformly dignified English.

C. F. ZEEK, JR.

*Southern Methodist University.*

---

*Forschungen zur deutschen Theatergeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, von Max Herrmann. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914.

This work by Max Herrmann consists of two quite distinct parts, a study in detail of the staging, costuming, and acting on Hans Sachs' stage, and a critical study of the drama illustrations of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. About one hundred and twenty of these are reproduced, a valuable feature of the work, made possible by financial support from the Director General of the Royal Theaters. These two investigations make a book of over five hundred pages with an abundance of interesting conclusions, such an abundance as to discourage detailed review and criticism.

Herrmann's reconstruction of Hans Sachs' stage is only a reconstruction of the stage in the Martha Church, in which his plays



were performed from 1550 on, and only the plays written in and after this year are used for the reconstruction. The stage directions of these plays are interpreted in terms of the conditions in the church and are fitted to them, to choir, sacristy, pulpit, choir-chair, etc., upon the assumption that Hans Sachs wrote with these conditions especially in mind. But it must be remembered that, in these same years from 1550 on, Sachs' plays were performed also, and apparently quite as often, in the refectory of the Dominican Monastery, a plain rectangular hall with no such conditions as are found in the Martha Church. The city archives inform us definitely that Hans Sachs himself directed performances of his plays here in 1557, and there are reasons for conjecturing that the companies that Hans Sachs himself directed played here more frequently than in the Martha Church. The staging of the plays in these two places, which were for so many years the chief 'theaters' of Nürnberg, may of course have been quite different, but the fact that the refectory stage, whatever its character may have been, would be perfectly possible in the church, while Herrmann's church stage would be quite impossible in the refectory, casts a reasonable doubt upon the rather elaborate and detailed reconstruction of the stage in the Martha Church.

In the study of the costumes Herrmann is able to seek information beyond the scant hints in the stage directions. He studies the medieval costume traditions and shows the probability of their survival to some extent in Hans Sachs' time, especially in his religious plays. He considers carefully the reawakened interest in both native and foreign costumes which developed about this time and resulted in a number of costume books. Some evidence of this interest in foreign costumes Herrmann finds reflected in the Spanish and Turkish costumes which the wardrobe of the Hans Sachs stage apparently contained. In general however the costumes were doubtless the usual costumes of the time for the various classes. Illustrations of some of these, as well as of Turkish and Spanish costumes, are given from the manuscript costume book of Sigismund Heldt, now in the library of the Berlin Kunstgewerbemuseum, which had its origin in Nürnberg, probably between 1565 and 1570, and may therefore be assumed to give a pretty faithful picture of the costumes of Hans Sachs' stage.

In the chapter on the art of acting Herrmann goes far afield as usual. He tries to trace the development of this art on the earlier

medieval stage. He even gives a full but not very fruitful study of the development of gesture in the various kinds of literature and in art from the early Middle Ages on. The bearing of this rather ponderous research upon the acting on Hans Sachs' stage is but slight. It is not for the purpose of supplementing the stage directions, for Herrmann reaches the conclusion (p. 141) that 'except in a few places Sachs' actors are not to make gestures or movements of the body or to give any definite coloring to their speech, unless the stage directions definitely prescribe it.' This seems an extreme conclusion and I do not consider it adequately proved, although there is no doubt that the acting was very declamatory.

The second part of the book, the study of the drama illustrations, concerns itself chiefly with the early editions of Terence, with certain illustrations of living pictures, especially in the Netherlands, and with illustrated editions of Swiss dramas, especially of Gengebach, Niklas Manuel, Friess, and Ruof. Perhaps the most valuable part of the whole work is Herrmann's careful study of the illustrations of the various early editions of Terence, including the tracing of the ideas underlying the title pictures of the different editions, which regularly represent a total view of a theater. Very interesting also is a series of illustrations of the living pictures in a Brussels procession of the year 1496. It is unfortunate that one of the most important and doubtless the most realistic series of German drama illustrations is not included in this study. These are the illustrations to Johann Rasser's *Spil von kinderzucht*, which appeared in Strassburg in 1574. Five of these may be found reproduced in the *Vorwort* of volume VI of Bolte's edition of the works of Wickram (*Bibl. des Litt. Vereins in Stuttgart*, 236, Bd., 1905), while five more are in an article by Schwabe in Vol. xxx (1912) of *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum etc.* There are also other regrettable omissions in this second part of the work.

Both in the introduction and occasionally in the body of the book Herrmann lays stress upon his work as a concrete example of method, as an attempt at a consistent following out of a line of investigation, one might almost say a line of thought, whithersoever it may lead, into any field of knowledge, however remote, that may throw light upon it, and to whatever results it may lead. It must be admitted that hitherto no one has carried out such an investigation so fully and consistently in the field of the history

of the early German stage. The first part, that concerning Hans Sachs, leads the author to many positive results, in my opinion at times all too positive. The results of the other investigation are largely negative; little is found in these illustrations that really pictures the early stage and the life on it.

It is greatly to be regretted that an appendix which the work was to have contained had to be omitted to keep the book within reasonable size. The appendix was to give the results of a collation of the Hans Sachs manuscripts with the printed text with reference to the stage directions, the variants of which are given only very incompletely in the Keller-Goetze edition. Herrmann's preface contains the generous promise to put this unpublished material in the manuscript division of the Berlin Royal Library for the use of any one interested.

NEIL C. BROOKS.

*University of Illinois.*

## CORRESPONDENCE

### A NOTE ON *Paradise Lost* IX

An illustration of the truth of at least a part of the assertion that most people believe in the Gospel according to Bunyan and in the Old Testament according to Milton is furnished by the persistence of the tradition of the seduction of Eve by Satan in the guise of a serpent, who during their colloquy stood on his tail.

This tradition is Miltonic, rather than Scriptural:

So spake the enemy of mankind, enclosed  
In serpent, inmate bad, and toward Eve  
Addressed his way—not with indented wave,  
Prone on the ground, as since, but on his rear,  
Circular base of rising folds, that towered  
Fold above fold, a surging maze; his head  
Crested aloft, and carbuncle his eyes;  
With burnished neck of verdant gold, erect  
Amidst his circling spires, that on the grass  
Floated redundant.—*P. L.*, ix, 494 ff.

For thus representing Eve's tempter as possessed of the devil, or in his downittings or his uprisings as other than an ordinary reptile, *Genesis* affords no justification. Here the tempter is described merely as "subtlest of the beasts of the field."<sup>1</sup>

The ascription of extreme subtlety to the serpent is universal

<sup>1</sup> The traditional wisdom of the serpent had become proverbial by the time of Jesus (*Matt.* x, 16). The saying is quoted as a proverb in the apocryphal *Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp*, i, 8.

among primitive peoples, and accounts for its association among both the Greeks and the Hebrews with the art of healing. The statue of Aesculapius at Epidaurus represented the god of healing as seated on a throne, holding in one hand a staff with a serpent coiled around it, the other hand resting upon the head of a snake (Paus., II, 27, 2).<sup>2</sup> A striking Hebrew analogy is furnished by the story of Moses's lifting up the serpent in the wilderness (*Num.* XXI, 8-9). Such a reputation for craftiness, rather than for diabolical possession, accounts for the Hebrew author's objectifying the temptation of Eve as a serpent.

Tho the popular identification of the serpent of *Genesis* with Satan is Miltonic rather than Scriptural, it did not originate with Milton. It certainly is as old as the apocryphal *Wisdom of Solomon*, written in the first century B. C., where we read (II, 24), "By the envy of the devil death entered into the world." In the following century the tradition was continued by the authors of the apocryphal New Testament. The author of the *First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ*, for example, affirms it;<sup>3</sup> and thru these apocryphal gospels it passed into the thought of the Church Fathers.<sup>4</sup> Thus St. Augustine lent to the support of the tradition the great weight of his authority, saying in his *De Civitate Dei* (xiv, xi, 2) concerning Satan, "That proud and envious angel . . . chose the serpent, because being slippery and moving in tortuous windings, it was suitable for his purposes."

Nor is the erect attitude of the serpent of the epic, tho unscriptural, without precedent in secular literature. In Aristotle's *History of Animals* (Bk. VIII, iv, 6), we find this amazing bit of unnatural natural history:

"The serpent swallows any food it can find, for it will eat both birds and beasts, and suck eggs. When it has taken its food, it draws itself up, till it stands erect upon its tail (*ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον*.) It then gathers itself up and contracts itself a little, so that when stretched out, the animal it has swallowed may descend in its stomach. It does this because its Esophagus is long and thin."

With the work of St. Augustine and of Aristotle Milton was entirely familiar. In the posthumous treatise on *Christian Doctrine* (Lib. I, Cap. VII) he mentions St. Augustine, referring with approval to his belief regarding the creation of souls.<sup>5</sup> Though

<sup>2</sup> The thirteenth constellation *ὄφιοῦχος*, "The Serpent-Holder," was identified as Aesculapius, Ovid, *Past.*, vi, 735. To the Greeks the serpent was a symbol of prudence, of rejuvenescence, and of prophecy.

<sup>3</sup> Possible even earlier is the reference in the *Book of Enoch* (696).

<sup>4</sup> The relations of the apocryphal gospels were credited by many of the earlier fathers. The Gospels above referred to is quoted by Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others.

<sup>5</sup> Milton's belief here stated "that souls are propagated from father to son in the natural order" is an echo of St. Augustine's assertion (*De Anima*, Lib. I, Cap. XIX, 55), "Animarum autem novarum sine propagine insufflationem, defendi quidem minime prohibemus," and of *De Civitate Dei*, Lib. XII, Cap. xx, 3.

he specifically mentions him but once, he evidently had read his works exhaustively, as numerous correspondences amply prove. Milton's identification of the pagan gods with the rebel angels, to mention but a single example he owed to St. Augustine who in the *De Civitate Dei* (Lib. VI and VII) argues at length for such an identification.<sup>6</sup> Tho Milton nowhere mentions the *History of Animals*, he mentions Aristotle six times in his prose writings, and in terms that imply a careful reading. Of these references five are to the political treatises, while the other is to Aristotle's work on the general principles of natural science (*Physica Auscultatio*, Lib. VIII, Cap. I).

While denying the Scriptural authority for Milton's identification of the serpent of "the Fall" with Satan, and for the serpent's attitude as described in the epic, we must admit that neither is unprecedented nor without a venerable antiquity.<sup>7</sup>

EDWARD CHAUNCEY BALDWIN.

University of Illinois.

---

#### NOTES ON THOMAS DELONEY

A curious error in Mr. F. O. Mann's valuable edition of the *Works of Thomas Deloney* (Oxford, 1912) has not, I think, been noted. On page vii Mr. Mann remarks that Deloney "appears to have drifted into literature from the more substantial occupation of silk-weaving, and his novels show the most intimate acquaintance with London life, but Nash's epithet 'the Balletting Silke Weauer of Norwich' seems to point to that town as the place of his birth, and it is significant that one of his earliest ballads—*The Lamentation of Beckles* (1586)—was printed 'for Nicholas Coleman of Norwich.'" He refers to *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, in R. B. McKerrow's edition of Nashe's *Works* (III, 84); and on a later page (xii) gives what purports to be Nashe's words: "Thomas Deloney, the Balletting Silke-Weauer, of Norwich, hath rime inough for all myracles."

As a matter of fact the quotation should read, "Thomas Deloney, the Balletting Silke-weauer, hath rime inough for all myracles." Nashe nowhere says that Deloney was from Norwich. Mr. Mann

<sup>6</sup> The idea is really much older than St. Augustine. Justin Martyr makes a similar assertion in his *First Apology for the Christians* (Chap. v). Its last appearance in a theological treatise is in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* (Bk. I, Chap. 4). "These wicked spirits," says Hooker, "the heathen honoured instead of gods, both generally under the name of Dii Inferi, gods infernal; and particularly, some in oracles, some in idols. . . ."

<sup>7</sup> I must beg leave to refer to the manner in which one of the earliest scholars of England handles the tradition here discussed. Alcuin's words may be read in Ælfrie's translation of the *Interrogationes Sigewulfi Presbyteri in Genesis*, *Anglia* VII, 24-26; Alfred Tessmann's dissertation (1891), p. 30.

J. W. B.



seems inadvertently to have followed J. W. Ebsworth, who in his *Dictionary of National Biography* sketch of Deloney declares that in *Have With You* Nashe wrote: "Thomas Deloney, the balleting silke-weaver of Norwich, hath rime inough for all myracles." This statement was also repeated by Richard Sievers (*Thomas Deloney*, Palaestra, xxxvi, 1) and was evidently accepted as true by Professor Lange (*Gentle Craft*, Palaestra, xviii, viii-ix).

The argument Mr. Mann builds on this misquotation for Deloney's residence at Norwich and for his Flemish or Walloon ancestry is, it would appear, untenable. There is little significance in the fact that Deloney's *Lamentation of Beckles* was printed for Nicholas Coleman of Norwich. Another ballad with almost exactly the same title as Deloney's and with exactly the same colophon ("At London: Imprinted by Robert Robinson, for Nicholas Coleman of Norwich, dwelling in S. Andrewes Church Yarde") was written by D. Sterrie, and is still preserved in the British Museum.<sup>1</sup> Coleman himself licensed one of these ballads—it is impossible to tell which—at Stationers' Hall;<sup>2</sup> and without doubt had simply commissioned Deloney and Sterrie to write them. All the evidence goes to show that in 1586 and for a number of years after, the ten or eleven stationers outside of London did not print ballads but merely sold those furnished to them by London printers. It would have been quite natural for a Norwich printer to order a ballad on a subject that he wanted exploited from a prominent London balladist like Deloney.

J. H. Dixon, editing the *Garland of Good Will* (Percy Society, xxx, vi) wrote: "The elegant and classic Drayton, in an allusion to [Deloney's] 'rhyme,' designates it 'full of state and pleasing.'" Ebsworth repeats this (*D. N. B.*). Neither supports the statement with a reference, but after much searching one will find in *The Legend of Matilda*<sup>3</sup> this passage:

Bright *Rosamond* so highly that is graced,  
Inroled in the register of fame,  
That in our sainted kalender is placed,  
By him who striues to stellifie her name;  
Yet will the modest say she was too blame,  
Though full of state and pleasing be his rime,  
Yet can his skill not expiate her crime.

This cannot possibly refer to Deloney. Few persons—certainly no poet—would call Deloney's ballad of *Rosamond* either full of state or pleasing; and Drayton held ballads in especial abomination. Sufficient proof of that is his slur at Elderton, a far more famous ballad-writer than Deloney, in his epistle "To Henery Reynolds."<sup>4</sup> Drayton was undoubtedly referring either to the treatment of *Rosamond* in Warner's *Albion's England* or, more probably, in Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond*.

<sup>1</sup> It is reprinted in Lilly's *Collection of 79 Ballads*, p. 78.

<sup>2</sup> On December 13, 1586 (Arber's *Transcript*, II, 461).

<sup>3</sup> *Poems*, 1605, Spenser Society ed., Pt. II, p. 447.

<sup>4</sup> *Minor Poems*, ed. C. Brett, Oxford, 1907, p. 109.



In Bishop Hall's *Satires*<sup>5</sup> occurs a passage ridiculing a "drunken rimer" who

sends forth thraues of Ballads to the sale.  
Nor then can rest: but volumes vp bodg'd rimes,  
To haue his name talk't of in future times,

which has been interpreted by Warton, Ritson, Collier, Grosart, and everybody else who has commented on the passage as an allusion to Elderton. Elderton, however, while notoriously a drunkard, volumed up no rimes, whether bodged or not. On the other hand, Deloney's *Garland of Good Will* seems to have been published in 1592/3,<sup>6</sup> and was certainly well known in 1596, the time at which Hall was probably writing. Accordingly, if Hall had any definite balladist in mind, it was Deloney. Elderton, furthermore, had died in or before 1592.

As allusions to Deloney are extremely hard to find, it seems worth while to add that the *Garland of Good Will* is slightly referred to in R. B.'s *Whimzies* (1631)<sup>7</sup> and that the following interesting notice of the *Gentle Craft* was printed among Sir John Harington's *Epigrams*:<sup>8</sup>

11 Of a Booke called the Gentle Craft.  
I Past this other day throwv Pauls Church-yard,  
I heard some reade a booke, and reading laught.  
The title of the booke was Gentle Craft.  
But when I markt the matter with regard,  
A nevv-sprung branch that in my mind did graft,  
And thus I said, Sirs, scorne not him that writ it:  
A gilded blade hath oft a dudgen haft,  
And well I see, this Writer rouses a shaft  
Neere fairest marke, yet happily not hit it,  
For neuer was the like booke sold in Poules,  
If so with Gentle Craft it could perswade  
Great Princes midst their pompe to learne a trade,  
Once in their liues to worke, to mend their soules.

The *Gentle Craft* was licensed for publication on October 19, 1597,<sup>9</sup> and Harington's verses have some importance as helping to establish the date at which he wrote the *Epigrams*. Deloney did not live to read and be flattered by this notice from a genteel writer; nor has the connection of the passage with his novel been pointed out before.<sup>10</sup>

HYDER E. ROLLINS.

Cambridge, Mass.

<sup>5</sup> Bk. iv, Sat. 6 (*Poems*, ed. A. B. Grosart, p. 131).

<sup>6</sup> Arber's *Transcript*, II, 627 (March 5, 1592/3).

<sup>7</sup> No. 2, "A Ballad-Monger."

<sup>8</sup> Bk. iv, No. 11 (1633 ed., added to his *Orlando Furioso*, 1634, sig. R r 4).

<sup>9</sup> Arber's *Transcript*, III, 93.

<sup>10</sup> Since these notes were written, the collection of essays published by the Oxford University Press as *Shakespeare's England* has appeared. I note that Professor C. H. Firth, in his essay on "Ballads and Broad-sides" (II, 512, 513), makes these statements about Deloney: "Nashe terms him 'the ballading silkweaver of Norwich,'" "Drayton found his style 'full of state and pleasing' " !

MATTHEW ARNOLD'S *The Church of Brou*

It seems not to have been noticed that the third section of Matthew Arnold's *The Church of Brou* reposes upon a page of Edgar Quinet's essay, *Les Arts de la Renaissance, et de l'Église de Brou*, written in 1834. Some of the best lines of Arnold's poem evidently derive from the following sentences:

"C'est de cette heure seulement que commence pour elle le vrai mariage dans son duché éternel, alors que les fanfares ne sonnent plus pour la chasse, que son époux sur son cheval fougueux ne poursuit plus jamais le sanglier dans la forêt, et qu'elle ne l'attend plus en vain jusqu'à la nuit, en sanglotant à la fenêtre de sa tour. . . . Les voilà qui dorment leur sommeil de marbre. Qui pourrait raconter leurs songes plus blancs que l'albâtre des tombeaux! Quand leurs froides paupières se soulèvent, ils voient les arceaux sur leurs têtes, la lumière transfigurée des vitraux, la Vierge et les saints immobiles à leurs places; et ils pensent en eux-mêmes: C'est ici l'éternité. . . . Quand le vent fait gémir les portes, ils murmurent entre eux: Qu'avez-vous, mon âme, pour soupirer si haut? et quand la pluie creuse le toit sur leurs têtes, ils se disent: Entendez-vous aussi sur votre dais la pluie de l'éternel amour?"

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

## BRIEF MENTION

*The Technic of Versification: Notes and Illustrations*, by William Odling (Oxford, Parker & Co., 1916). A Professor of Natural Science, appealing to the example set by his "late eminent colleague and long-while personal friend, Professor J. J. Sylvester," has ventured, by way of recreation for old age, to put pen to paper on a subject that has from an early day been a matter of interest to him. Believing that readers of poetry are not well supplied with encouraging means to become familiar with the art of versification, he hopes to persuade them of the truth of Poe's statement that "in fact the subject is exceedingly simple." If the subject be simple, "exceedingly simple," it must be possible for one not technically equipped for the task to supply "a sufficiently full and particularized setting forth of the Technic of Versification, to afford him [the general reader] some measure of information and of satisfaction with regard to it." This mode of reasoning would be promptly rejected, if applied to any other of the fine arts. Is it valid for versification, with technicalities that are intimately bound up with the essential principles of the supreme art of poetry?

The art of poetry is closely allied to the art of vernacular speech, and it follows that a refined sense for the latter should lead to a

quick perception of the former; and both the practiced art and the unpracticed but appreciated art should prepare the mind for instruction in the principles governing each. The ordinary experience of acquiring one's vernacular, aided by the grammar of the school-room, does not, however, fit one for a technical explanation of approved usage. Even a skilful French writer, for example, would be unfitted, except by special historic and analytic study, to explain his vernacular use of the article. That is a profound chapter in the philosophic grammar of his language, but he may not trouble himself about it. Nor does the mere appreciation of the effects of rhythmically measured language, assisted by the traditional school-room knowledge of the elements of versification, equip one for an authoritative handling of the subject. So too, to complete the obvious parallelism, the poets conform to and establish conventionalities in the artistic use of language in accordance with a refined perception of the rhythmic permissibilities of their vernacular, and not in obedience to a technical or thoroly scientific familiarity with the more recondite facts concerning their language. It is the character of too many treatises on versification that justifies insistent repetition of the plain truth that the art of versification is based on the laws and conventionalities of the language employed, which, to be accurately understood, must be inquired into by the processes of accurate study.

Mr. Odling's sub-title, "Notes and Illustrations," describes the plan of the book. The first part consists of "Notes," in which the usual description of the externalities of the art is traversed, but not without some less usual observations of importance. His style of writing is, however, unattractive, even reprehensible. To read a treatise composed after the manner of a synoptical enumeration, in which the construction of the independent nominative is used exclusively, is a task that presupposes a degree of sustained interest in excess of what may be normally demanded of the elementary student or of the general reader. A paragraph may be cited. It will be observed, in slight extenuation of the judgment just expressed, that Mr. Odling has no little skill in his method. Under the heading of "Essentials of Verse" he writes: "Recognizability for the most part of even a single isolated line as being not a short line of prose, but a line of verse—that is to say, as being itself a verse. Such recognizability dependent *mainly* on modes of expression—however indefinable—specially characteristic of verse. But further than this, even quite commonplace lines of verse distinguishable from lines of prose by the two conditions of strictly curtailed length and regular sequence of stress" (p. 21).

In the second and larger part of the book (pp. 31-90), Mr. Odling displays his "Illustrations" of the various forms and combinations of lines. The cited passages are marked off into component 'feet' by spaces and bars that give the matter a resemblance to an accountant's columns of figures. The unattractive page is, how-

ever, a picture of the essential features of Mr. Odling's main contention. He is most specifically concerned with the pauses by which he would mark off the 'feet' of a line, with the pauses that must show the determinative length of a line, and secondarily with the pauses denoted by punctuation. But his columns of 'feet' are sometimes wrongly composed. For example, the rhythm of the alternate lines of Shelley's *When the lamp is shattered* is thus misrepresented: "The light in | the dúst | lies déad;" "The rainbow's | glory | is shed;" "Sweet tones are | remem- | ber'd not;" "Lov'd accents | are soon | forgot" (p. 63). Mr. Odling has recalled from merited banishment the amphibrach. His ample illustrations of the assumed use of this impossible rhythmic unit are, of course, all incorrectly scanned.

Mr. Odling, with but minor vacillation, adheres to 'routine scansion,' or, as it may be expressed, scansion according to the rhythmic signature. This is his chief merit. That this is the true method of scansion should, however, be shown by a discussion of the character of the rhythmic elements of the language,—a technical matter, which would be more than appropriate in a work entitled *The Technic of Versification*.

J. W. B.

*Casos Cervantinos que tocan a Valladolid*, por Narciso Alonso Cortés. Madrid, 1916 (Junta para ampliación de Estudios e investigaciones científicas Centro de Estudios históricos). In this work Sr. Cortés, whose investigations in the archives of Valladolid have brought to light so much important information concerning the lives of Spanish men of letters, has made a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the family of Cervantes. It is especially interesting for the new data it furnishes in regard to the licentiate Juan de Cervantes, the grandfather of the author of *Don Quixote*. Sr. Cortés thinks that, until the contrary be demonstrated, "en Talavera estaba el solar de Miguel de Cervantes," and that the branch from which he descended had settled in Seville before 1488. The author also thinks it quite probable that Cervantes may have taken the name Saavedra from the Saavedras of Seville. From Seville the ancestors of Cervantes went to Córdoba, where we find his great-grandfather "el bachiller Rodrigo de Cervantes" in 1488. Here Rodrigo married Doña Catalina de Cabrera, and here probably the licentiate Juan de Cervantes married Leonor de Torreblanca. This marriage took place in 1505 or earlier. About this time the family must have moved to Alcalá de Henares, of which Juan de Cervantes was *corregidor* in 1509. In 1528 we find him, as "oidor del Consejo del duque del Infantado," living in Guadalajara with his four children: Juan, Rodrigo (father of Miguel), doña Maria and Andrés.

The story of these days, the relations of doña Maria with the archdeacon of Guadalajara and Talavera, D. Martin de Mendoza, and the *pleito delicado* which followed, are not very edifying read-

ing. Speaking of Da. Magdalena de Cervantes, sister of the author of *Don Quixote*, Sr. Cortés observes: "Como casi todas las mujeres de esta misteriosa familia,—no hay por qué ocultarlo,—ofrece en su vida episodios sobradamente sospechosos." The book contains much other matter of importance concerning personages more or less closely connected with Cervantes and his works, and worthily supplements the publications of Pérez Pastor and Rodríguez Marín.

H. A. R.

*Morte Arthure*, mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Glossar, hrsg. von Erik Björkman (Alt- und Mittelhochdeutsche Texte, hrsg. von L. Morsbach und F. Holthausen. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1915). The Middle English alliterative *Morte Arthure*, which is preserved in the unique Thornton ms. of the Lincoln Cathedral Library, has been edited several times before but never so well as in this edition by Professor Björkman. Here is supplied a complete critical apparatus—introduction, notes, and glossary—to say nothing of an abstract of the story of the poem. As is well known, the vocabulary of the *Morte Arthure* presents many problems of difficulty, and it is perhaps from this point of view that the present edition marks the greatest advance upon its predecessors. The labor which Professor Björkman has expended on this side of his work is apparent not only in his excellent glossary, but in the numerous discussions of rare and difficult words in his notes. The annotations, however, on textual and other questions are also much more numerous than in the previous editions, and they exhibit the qualities of succinctness and accuracy, which distinguish all the editor's work.

As regards the subjects dealt with in the introduction, it should be observed that Professor Björkman rejects the ascription of the *Morte Arthure* to Huchown. He accepts apparently the English origin of the poem. Doubtless owing to the plan of the series in which this edition is published, he gives us no discussion of the interesting problem of the source of the romance. He expresses his approval, however, of Imelmann's conclusions on this head, which nowadays no one will be inclined to dispute, namely, that the source in question is ultimately a French expanded version of Wace's *Brut*. Perhaps the poet's immediate original was a modification of this expanded version.

J. D. B.

Snorri Sturluson's triad of poetic apprenticeship has never been completely done into English. Bishop Percy, G. W. Dasent, of *Njáls Saga* fame, R. B. Anderson, I. A. Blackwell, and S. Laing rendered only parts of it, preferably the *Gylfaginning*. The latest translation, A. G. Brodeur's *Prose Edda* (Publ. of the American-Scandinavian Foundation, New York, 1916, xxii + 266 pp.), is also still incomplete. The *Gylfaginning*, that treasure-house of



Odinic cosmogony (a Danish translation of which, by Finnur Jónsson, 1902, seems to have escaped Dr. Brodeur's attention), and the *Skáldskaparmál*, the book of scaldic lore, are printed in a combination of careful work and attractive type, but the *Háttatal*, Snorri's *Clavis Metrica*, has again received a step-motherly treatment. It would have been especially praiseworthy to present its paraphrase of *Kenningar*, because the technical nature of the latter militates against their accessibility.

Critical probes and comparison with the Old Norse text prove the translation to be far superior to Anderson's, which has thus far been the best version. Translating the Eddic literature cannot be considered a matter of routine readiness. Wilhelm von Humboldt held that there was no golden medium between violating an original and outraging the vernacular. But then a perfect translation would be the original itself, and we can demand no more than that the translator conform to a reasonable extent to the genius of both languages. Dr. Brodeur's version, clear-cut and terse, happily avoids the enticing possibility of the paraphrase and sentence-completion so characteristic of the earlier translators. With a material which cannot, by its very nature, avoid the 'fatal impression' of translation, he has done well. A deeper study of the reciprocal relations of rhythm and exactness of meaning in the poetical insertions would, however, have improved his work.

The mechanical appearance of the book is a pleasure to the eye. The Foundation should by all means encourage the translation, preferably a collaboration of several scholars, of the *Elder Edda* as well. Vigfússon and Powell's version is in prose; Thorpe's is not composed in alliterative verse; and Miss Bray's is both incomplete and ambiguous for the sake of literary effect.

A. G.

Walter C. Bronson's *American Prose* (University of Chicago Press, 1916) is a companion volume to his *American Poems*. The two books constitute the most comprehensive and serviceable anthology available for college courses in American literature. Nearly one-third of the closely printed text of the *Prose* is given to the colonial and revolutionary periods. Such emphasis upon the early writers, most of whom have little significance for literature, is justified by their historical importance and by the fact that the originals are mostly inaccessible to students. Works in the nineteenth century are restricted to the period ending with the close of the Civil War. They include, in speeches by Calhoun, Webster, and Lincoln, a representation of American oratory in the fifties. A valuable feature of the notes is the inclusion of generous excerpts from contemporary criticism of the works selected. It is unfortunate that a desire to give complete works should have led to the omission of so important a writer as Charles Brockden Brown.

J. C. F.